JPRS-TAC-86-037

30 APRIL 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-037

30 APRIL 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

Arms Control

Contents

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] U.S. [illegible] OF [illegible] "[illegible]"

[illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON ITALIAN SDI INVOLVEMENT

PM081037 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 86 First Edition p 5

[Gennadiy Zafesov commentary: "In the Role of Underlings"]

[Text] Rome -- The Italian Government has now officially announced its intentions of joining in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

At a joint session of the Senate Foreign Affairs and Defense Committees, Minister of Foreign Affairs G. Andreotti, stated that "the moment has come to define, together with the United States, the framework within which Italian companies could take part in the research phase of SDI." Defense Minister G. Spadolini added that future cooperation "requires agreement at government level."

As though forseeing a negative reaction from the public, both ministers hurried to conceal the dangerous nature of the matter behind a screen of various stipulations. They tried to lull the Italians' concern with empty assertions, such as that "the research section of the ('star wars' -- G.Z.) program will not have a negative effect on the stability of the strategic equilibrium on a global scale."

A strange statement, it must be admitted. The leading Italian ministers, if anyone, should realize that the main aim of Washington's SDI is precisely to change in their favor the established approximate equilibrium of forces. And this, in turn, threatens to push the world toward a new spiral of the arms race, with unpredictable consequences.

Nor can the claims that Italy supposedly cannot miss the opportunity for "its industry to take part in scientific and technical cooperation" stand up to criticism.

First, the United States has so far displayed interest only in a few Italian projects. Second, as Carlos Rubia, the well-known Italian physicist and Nobel prizewinner, points out, the very idea that "progress in technology requires the development of new methods of destroying people" is absurd.

The government statement gave rise to sharp criticism. On behalf of the Italian Communist Party, Senator G. Procacci came out against space militarization plans.

Left-wing independent Senator E. Milani assessed the ministers' position as a de facto involvement in SDI, for which they are now trying to create a political basis.

Despite wide demands for the problem of participation in SDI to be taken beyond the bounds of the two Senate committees, the government is trying to prevent general parliamentary debates. It is clearly under pressure from its ally across the ocean and its own military monopolies.

Meanwhile the opposition to U.S. "star wars" plans is growing and not only in Italian parliamentary and political circles. The Italians, who not long ago were made to accept U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles on their territory, evidently do not want to become Washington's underlings in its new militarist venture.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1333

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS AUSTRALIA WITHHOLDING SUPPORT OF SDI

LD092035 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 9 Apr 86

[Text] Canberra April 9 TASS -- Australian Defence Minister Kim Beazley stated in parliament on Tuesday that Australia would not officially participate in the "star wars" programme or in SDI-related research. He emphasized that the government did not intend to enter into any negotiations with the USA on the conclusion of agreements the kind of those which had already been signed or were being worked out between the United States, Britain, the FRG or Japan. Mr. Beazely pointed out that the Australian Government did not support the "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) concept and that it would not conduct any negotiations on a broad agreement of that kind.

The Australian defence minister said this in parliament in answer to a question about the Australian Government's stand in connection with local press reports that the country's government was ostensibly prepared to make a compromise under the pressure of the ally across the ocean: not to prevent private companies and research organisations from participating in the SDI programme provided their activities are not directly connected with the development of space weapons. The reports sparked off an outburst of indignation among the public and wrathful statements by representatives of the scientific circles and mass media of the country that the entire "star wars" programme is aimed at creating space weapons and that, therefore, it is impossible to engage in peaceful research within the SDI framework.

"THE AUSTRALIAN" newspaper reports that at the same time no firm promises to prevent the participation of Australian business in the implementation of the SDI were voiced at the meeting of the parliamentary group of the ruling Labour Party.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1333

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR AMBASSADOR CRITICIZES FRG SDI PARTICIPATION

LD091938 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1500 GMT 9 Apr 86

[Excerpts] The Soviet ambassador to Helsinki, V.M. Sobolev, explained the recent Soviet arms limitation proposals at a press conference today. Sobolev criticized the U.S. SDI plans saying that they could endanger the nuclear weapons balance and transfer the arms race into space, in which case it would be almost impossible to control.

Sobolev was asked, among other things, about his view of the West German Government's decision to permit FRG enterprises to participate in the U.S. SDI research.

Ambassador Sobolev said the decision of the FRG Government conflicts with the earlier statements by the country's leadership according to which never again will a threat to world peace and security originate from German soil.

FRG Minister for Economics Martin Bangemann recently signed an agreement in the United States on the participation of FRG enterprises in the star wars plans.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1333

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TASS ON JAPANESE SDI DISCUSSION—Tokyo, 20 Apr (TASS)—The Japanese Government will shortly set up a special body to decide on participation in the American "Strategic Defence Initiative" programme, according to Keichi Kato, director-general of the Defence Agency. He disclosed, speaking in parliament, that the new commission would study U.S. proposals gathered by the third delegation of experts from government agencies and private concerns, who recently completed a tour of U.S. military space centres. Government officials announced earlier that the decision on Japan's involvement in the "Star Wars" programme could be adopted on the basis of the delegation's recommendations. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0627 GMT 20 Apr 88 LD] /9274

USSR PUBLISHES BOOK ON PEACEFUL SPACE USE—The second volume of the two-volume publication "The USSR's Struggle for the Peaceful Use of Outer Space" ["Borba SSSR za Mirnoye Ispolzovaniye Kosmosa"] (1957-1988), prepared by the USSR Foreign Ministry, has been published. The volume includes the most important treaties, accords, and UN resolutions relating to problems of outer space. The section "Our Aim—The demilitarization of Outer Space" publishes speeches by M. S. Gorbachev expounding Soviet proposals aimed at preventing the appearance of nuclear weapons in outer space. Other documents and items are also published. The collection is published by the Political Literature Publishing House. [Text] [TASS report: "For a Peaceful Outer Space"] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 88 Morning Edition p 3] /9274

CSO: 5200/1333

[illegible]

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S SOMLAKOV, FRG DELEGATION DISCUSS DISARMAMENT

LD131500 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1412 GMT 13 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow, 13 Apr (TASS) -- A group of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, headed by Mikhail Gorbachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today continued consultations on the USSR Supreme Soviet with a delegation from the Bundestag and the Federal Representative of the West German Bundestag, Juri Ivo Egge Bahr, chairman of the subcommission. Taking part in the consultations from the Soviet side were the following: USSR Supreme Soviet deputies Yevgeniy Gorbachev, Georgiy Shikin, Yuriy Israel, and other officials. From the West German side: deputies of the Bundestag Gerhard Stoltenberg of the Social Democratic Party, Jurgen Todenhoefer of the Christian Democratic Union, Hans Hain of the Christian Social Union, Helmut Schmidt of the Free Democratic Party, and Dietrich Lange of the "Greens" party.

The sides held a thorough exchange of opinions about topical international problems and questions of bilateral relations. Emphasis attached the importance of maintaining political dialogue which would facilitate the solution of burning problems and the return of international relations to the channel of detente. Speakers spoke in all spheres aimed at ending the arms race, about all nuclear arms, and preventing the spread to space and reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe are needed now more than ever, he said.

The West German parliamentarians' attention was drawn to the historic significance of Mikhail Gorbachev's January statement which advanced a program for the total elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons by the beginning of the 21 millennium. The Soviet side made a principled assessment of the U.S. Government's refusal to stop nuclear testing and join the USSR's real and concrete efforts directed at ending the nuclear arms race and abolishing nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union, it was said, favors reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe and is prepared to cooperate on this issue with all countries on the continent, including the FRG.

It was stressed that to signing the arms agreement in Geneva contributes to the American program to develop space strike weapons. Due to assuming equal responsibility with the United States for safeguarding world security. Emphasis said that the Soviet Union's principled position, oriented at mutually beneficial cooperation with the FRG on the basis of the Moscow Treaty and consideration for the two countries' interests, remains unchanged. The USSR is firmly committed to the preservation and multiplication of the experience accumulated in bilateral cooperation, he pointed out.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR ATTACKS U.S. PLANS FOR CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN EUROPE

'Criminal Conspiracy Against Europe'

PM110915 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Apr 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladimir Mikhaylov "Commentator's Column": "Conspiracy Against Europe"]

[Text] A new threat is advancing on Europe. In addition to nuclear missiles, Washington intends to bring ultramodern chemical weapons here, despite the fact that it was here that this barbarous means of mass destruction was used for the first time, on 22 April 1915. The world, shocked by the cruel consequences, outlawed its use. And now...

The Americans first used the uncontrolled right of occupying forces to bring chemical weapons into West European territory, or more specifically the FRG, soon after World War II. Now it is a question of binary weapons, which consist of two components and have an extremely strong neuroparalytic action. Some $10 billion have already been allocated for their production in the United States. Production lines have been prepared at the plants. The startup date has been set -- "after 1 October 1986."

The NATO apparatus has been set in motion. Back in February the Pentagon sent its military committee a "directive on the distribution of forces." This defines the "chemicalization" of the U.S. European allies as "one of the main avenues of NATO activity." Now the discussion of the "directive" is nearing completion in the military planning committee. Finally, in May the defense and foreign ministers are to meet to "give their blessing" to the Pentagon's criminal conspiracy against Europe.

It was planned to present this action in the United States as a "European decision," and it will provide the White House with justification for launching the large-scale production of the new generation of chemical weapons. The West Europeans, on the other hand, are reassured that the weapons will remain in the United States until a "crisis situation" arises in Europe. Of course, Washington reserves the right to define the emergence of such a situation.

In creating its "European alibi" Washington gambles mainly on the FRG. Will it assume the role of pusher, as it did with the American missiles? Since the American Congress has transferred to the Europeans the responsibility for the decision, E. Bahr, chairman of the Bundestag subcommittee for disarmament and arms control, stated at a Bonn press conference, the (FRG) Federal Government bears the decisive responsibility for the new spiral in the chemical arms race. If it says "No," no other European ally will say "yes."

The decision being prepared in NATO in accordance with the American scenario also has a global aspect. What would happen, for instance, to the talks on banning and eliminating chemical weapons that are under way in Geneva? Is not that why the FRG is so passive in relation to the cause proposed by the Soviet Union of completely ridding Europe of chemical weapons, and is not that why it has refused to support the GDR and CSSR initiative on creating a zone free of such weapons in central Europe?

The Pentagonites and their underlings on this side of the Atlantic have something different on their minds: How to pile up even more weapons on European soil, destroy the foundations of detente that have survived here, and thereby put Western Europe neo-globalist policy.

Pentagon Spokesman Cited

LD110952 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 11 Apr 86

[Text] Washington April 11 TASS -- Washington is negotiating with its NATO allies the deployment in Western Europe of a new generation of the barbarous chemical weapons -- the so-called binary munitions. This was officially admitted by Thomas Welch, U.S. deputy assistant to the secretary of defence (chemical matters). Being aware that the dangerous designs of the U.S. military will touch off a storm of indignation among the West European nations, Thomas Welch stressed that the USA should " try to avoid a politicized debate in European parliaments" on that issue.

Addressing hearings at a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, he said that the administration requested in the 1987 fiscal year 1.14 billion dollars for the implementation of the "chemical rearmament" program. It is planned to set aside from that sum a total of 200 million dollars to develop and create combat offensive chemical weapons. According to Thomas Welch, preparations are drawing to a close for the start of large-scale batch production of binary artillery shells for 155-millimetre Howitzers. A total of 58.4 million dollars are requested for the purchase of such shells in the next fiscal year. Their production is to be started in December 1987.

The spokesman for the Pentagon also pointed out that the U.S. Navy and Air Force had completed the first stage of proving ground testing of binary air bombs "Big Eye." The results of that testing have shown, Thomas Welch said, that the system is potentially ready for production, whose start has been planned for the 1987 fiscal year. He admitted that they are designed for launching strikes deep into enemy territory.

Thomas Welch claimed that the USA is "weak" in the field of chemical weapons. Yet the facts attest to the contrary. At present the United States has the world's biggest chemical weapons arsenals. Fifty-five thousand tons of high toxic agents of various designation in mines, grenades, artillery shells, air bombs -- in all more than 90 types of ammunition -- are stored at the Pentagon's military depots.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1332

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET CRITICISM OF U.S. TEST BAN REFUSAL CONTINUES

PRAVDA Recalls History of Issue

PM091438 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by N. Prozhogin: "Nuclear Tests Must Be Banned. The Goodwill of the USSR and Washington's Irresponsible Course"]

[Text] The world has entered a stage of its development where new approaches to questions of international security are essential. We can no longer think in terms of the past, because now it is a question not only of the preservation of peace but also of mankind's survival.

Yes, mankind has reached a point that demands the utmost responsibility on the part of each and everyone, and primarily, of course, from the leaders of powers possessing nuclear weapons.

It is still not too late to stop the nuclear arms race. But the first major step in this direction must be taken without delay. Such a step could be the cessation of nuclear tests by everyone -- starting with the Soviet Union and the United States, but also other nuclear powers. M.S. Gorbachev once again urgently called for this when speaking recently on Soviet television.

The wise tale by the Dane Hans Christian Andersen, "The Emperor's New Clothes," is popular throughout the world. However, even the wisest parables do not benefit everyone. High-ranking figures in the present Washington administration, who, it is to be hoped, also read Andersen in their childhood, have sewn the splendid attire of peacemakers out of words and arrayed themselves in it, supposing that they can thereby conceal their militarist nudity from the world. And they have found themselves in the position of the naked emperor.

On 22 March the United States carried out another nuclear explosion and, to all appearances, intends to repeat the test in the immediate future. This blatant challenge has been thrown down not only to our country, but to all peoples, including the American people, who urgently demand that nuclear testing be stopped.

If these tests were to be stopped everywhere, this would signify a real step in the direction of curbing the nuclear arms race. It is a secret to no one that they serve to perfect and improve new forms and types of mass destruction weapons even more dangerous than those already in existence. Conversely ceasing tests would signify

the automatic "ageing" of nuclear weapons. Also obvious is the fact that nuclear explosions cause great damage, the extent of which is not yet fully known, to the environment in which mankind lives. The problem of ceasing nuclear testing has its own, already long history. It is useful to recall the basic stages of this history.

As early as 1955 the Soviet Union appealed to all states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons to pledge to cease testing these weapons. The stand taken by the Western powers was negative. But the Soviet Union continued to expend efforts to achieve this aim. They had decisive significance for the conclusion in 1963 of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water. Let us note that even then the USSR was in favor of stopping all tests, including those underground, but the United States, Britain, and France refused.

The persistent, consistent policy of the Soviet Union led to treaties being signed between our country and the United States in 1974 and 1975, the first of which limited the size of underground nuclear explosions. It is not our fault that both these treaties remained unratified.

It is indicative that in the very interim period between the signing of these documents -- in 1975 -- the overwhelming majority of states of the world supported the Soviet draft multiparty treaty on a total ban on nuclear tests that was submitted for discussion by the UN General Assembly. However, it was rejected by those on whom this matter primarily depended.

In 1977, again on a Soviet initiative, tripartite negotiations began between the USSR, the United States, and Britain to work out a treaty on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapon tests. Considerable progress had already been made during the talks when, in 1980, the United States, followed by Britain, refused to continue them. Thus, through the fault of the Western powers, primarily the United States, the problem of stopping nuclear explosions remained unsolved.

Then last summer the Soviet Union took an extremely important step. Recognizing the great responsibility that rests with the nuclear powers and demonstrating the practical political will necessary to solve present buring problems, the USSR announced a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions, be they for military or peaceful purposes. The date the moratorium was introduced -- 6 August, the 40th anniversary of the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima -- is symbolic, in the highest sense of this word. It was to remain in effect until 1 January 1986. Urging the United States to do the same, the USSR simultaneously announced that the moratorium would remain in force even longer if the United States for its part also refrained from carrying out nuclear explosions.

This was a real step in a direction leading to our planet being cleansed of nuclear weapons. It is obvious that, once it has become mutual for the two largest nuclear powers, the moratorium would serve as a good example for other states possessing these weapons and would create favorable conditions for concluding an international treaty on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapon tests.

The results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva and the hopeful joint statement prompted the USSR to take another goodwill step -- the unilateral Soviet moratorium was extended until 31 March 1986. A special section of the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, containing an integrated program to rid mankind of mass destruction weapons was devoted to the task of stopping nuclear explosions.

After a certain degree of confusion and an awkward attempt to declare the Soviet moratorium a "propaganda trick," Washington refused to follow the Soviet example and

announced that it would continue nuclear explosions. According to a report in THE NEW YORK TIMES, high-ranking officials in charge of arms control problems have said that "objections must be raised as before against any moratorium on testing, as nuclear weapons age in exactly the same way as their creators do, and their efficiency at any given moment can be verified only with the aid of tests." An example of militarist logic!

However, the universal approval, including in the United States itself, of the step taken by the Soviet Union and the hopes it has inspired throughout the world of freeing mankind from the nuclear threat have forced Washington to seek arguments to justify its course of continuing nuclear tests and, consequently, the nuclear arms race itself. Two such "arguments" have been put forward.

The first amounts to the fact that the United States is supposedly lagging behind the Soviet Union in the nuclear weapons sphere and that is why, they say, they must continue improving these weapons by conducting new tests. Meanwhile it is well known that the United States has carried out considerably more nuclear tests than the USSR. Thus, according to statistics from the Stockholm Peace Research Institute, at the time the Soviet moratorium was announced the United States had carried out approximately one-third more nuclear explosions than the USSR and, together with other nuclear powers in the West -- 1.5 times more.

It is not, however, a question of arithmetic. In making the decision on a unilateral moratorium the Soviet Union was guided by principled political considerations. For us it is not a question of a breathing space between explosions but of contributing to a complete and general cessation of nuclear weapon tests.

The second "argument," according to which it would supposedly be impossible to monitor observance of a ban on nuclear tests, is utterly false. Highly qualified specialists, including American specialists, confirm that scientific and technical means available not only in the USSR and the United States, but also in other countries, give the necessary degree of confidence that a nuclear explosion, even of small yield, be detected. Convincing evidence of this was the Soviet Union's announcement of information on a scheduled American nuclear explosion carried out on 17 August last year: yield of less than 20 kilotons, a 330 meter deep silo 120 km northwest of Las Vegas. Claims by American politicians concerning the ineffectiveness of national monitoring means were thereby once again clearly refuted.

The Soviet Union has said more than once that, in conformity with a ban on nuclear tests, monitoring could be ensured both by national technical means and with the aid of international procedures -- in necessary cases also with on-site inspection. The USSR has proposed to the American side that an agreement be reached on granting the opportunity to observers from both sides, on a mutual basis and in accordance with corresponding requirements, to visit the sites of indeterminate phenomena in order to eliminate possible doubts as to whether they are connected with nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union is also agreeable to both itself and the United States using assistance in verification, including the on-site inspection proposed by the leaders of six countries -- Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden, and Greece.

One month remained until the expiration of the extended Soviet moratorium when the leaders of the six aforementioned countries put to M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan a new urgent appeal not to sanction any nuclear tests before the Soviet-American summit meeting. The six leaders, who are the heads of states situated on different continents and belonging to the groups of nonaligned, neutral, and even NATO countries, had every reason to state: "We are sure that this would be regarded throughout the world as evidence that you both are prepared at this meeting to draw practical conclusions from your

[illegible] statement in Izvestia that "nuclear and space weapons must always be mutually and closely tied, so we [illegible] eligible to such a war."

The ideas on universal security without nuclear weapons that were expressed in their message are highly consonant with the concepts put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress, of forming an all-embracing international security system, one of the principled planks of which must be the total and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons.

Replying to this message, M.S. Gorbachev announced: "The Soviet Union will not conduct nuclear explosions even after 31 March — until the first nuclear explosion in the United States."

And what was Washington's response? Without waiting for the extended Soviet moratorium to expire, the United States conducted the explosion of a nuclear device at a testing ground in Nevada, and now it is preparing for another. It also rejected, out of hand as they say, the USSR's new peace initiative delivered on 28 March by the Soviet leader, who proposed, in particular, meeting the U.S. President in the near future to reach an agreement on the question of stopping nuclear tests. The United States is thereby openly demonstrating its reluctance to make use of a real opportunity to halt the qualitative arms race in its most dangerous area. What is more, the continuation of nuclear explosions is openly connected in the United States with realization of the "star wars" program and with the development of space-based strike weapons.

Under these conditions the Soviet Union has had every reason to resume its nuclear tests. It cannot extend its unilateral moratorium indefinitely. By not conducting any nuclear explosions — either for testing or for peaceful purposes — for more than 8 months, our country has already incurred costs in both the military and economic respects.

But the Soviet Union is true to its word. Even after the expiration of the Soviet moratorium on 31 March our country will not conduct nuclear explosions. So it will be in the future if the United States takes similar action. If the reverse should be the case, and this must be clear to all, the USSR will be forced to resume its nuclear tests as our country cannot forgo either its own security or that of its allies.

However, the Soviet leadership has nevertheless expressed the hope that the U.S. President, his closest associates, and the American Congress alike will still consider the USSR's proposal to conclude an agreement on stopping nuclear explosions.

It is Washington's fault that the fate of mankind is now under real threat. And the peoples — of this there is no doubt — will continue to stay up their struggle to stop all nuclear weapon tests and conclude a treaty on a complete and general ban on such tests.

"Top Priority" Discussion

LD091615 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 6 Apr 86

["Top Priority" roundtable program hosted by Vladimir Posner, with Dr. Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States of America and Canada]

[Text] [Posner] (?We) proposed that the test ban would last until the end of the year, from the 6th August when it was announced to the 31st January 1986. But if the United States would join, then it would become permanent. The United States did not join, and in January the Soviet Government reconsidered its decision to prolong [illegible]

since then until the 31st March 1986, and again invited the United States to join us in the name of a permanent test ban on all nuclear tests as the first step toward stopping the arms race and as a major step towards nuclear disarmament. The United States has flatly refused.

[Bogdanov] You know...

[Posner, interrupting] Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Vladimir, my reaction is rather a sad one, because I have to state that this administration is really able to produce any dramatic [change].

They are just paralyzed by one idea, to go ahead with nuclear testing to gain superiority over the Soviet Union. Now, if you read their statements -- political statements, semi-official statements, explanations and so on -- you will see the truth, and the truth is that this administration is in very great need to improve their nuclear capability, to create, develop and test new nuclear war [fare].

[Posner] I'd like to interrupt.

[Bogdanov] That's number one.

[Posner] I want to interrupt you because you say this administration, meaning the Reagan administration, is in need to develop. Now, you use the word need. What do you mean by that?

[Bogdanov] [Since] I deliberately, I deliberately used this word. They are really in need, they need it, because if you have a policy of nuclear superiority, then you need to improve always, always improve your warheads, your nuclear capability. That's why you are in need, that's why I mean by that.

[Posner] But they mean something different. They, they say that we have superiority. You've heard them say that we're ahead of them.

[Bogdanov] You know that's a very old story, and there's no bit of truth in that. You know, as to the number of nuclear tests, we have one-third less than they had, and if you add to that the nuclear tests of American allies, you will see that almost two-and-a-half or three times more they had nuclear tests. Then you know you have, you have another very important point. They say that what we are proposing, what we are suggesting, subjecting [words indistinct]. We don't mean that. We have been offering -- we several times, please, for heaven's sake stop the nuclear arms race. We give you very good chance. It is in interests of both parties to stop testing. If they call it propaganda, OK, let it be propaganda; I'm for that propaganda, I'm for that propaganda. But within the meaning, we, we've been insisting on that. [Though] they say -- you know for instance, I met several days ago some rather important Americans. They were telling me: Look, you Soviets from the very beginning, you were sure that the President will not accept your offer, but still you have suggested that he should accept it. So you would like to put our President in an awkward position. I don't see any logic in that. You know, if you have to keep in mind, you know, the President's stature as a statesman, that's one thing, but if you have in mind something very substantial [word indistinct] [security of world].

[Posner] Some national interest?

[Bogdanov] National interest something, something else, you know. Then we witness now, you know, we witness now a very very dangerous situation. You, we, witness if you like,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

and I present ourselves before Saint Peter, and he says: 'You are both responsible for dropping the atomic bombs. What can you say in your defense?'"

Atomic bombs are not being dropped on peaceful people on our planet in the mid-eighties. But this does not mean that mankind is not threatened with nuclear catastrophe. The world's peoples heard its echo just 2 weeks ago -- in the explosion at the Nevada test site where the Pentagon tries out new nuclear weapons.

For 8 months now, the Soviet Union has been strictly fulfilling its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. During these same 8 months, the United States has not moved a single step closer to solving a problem that is as clear as it is important. On the other hand, it has made considerable efforts to bring its closest allies "into line" ["podravnyat" po svoyemu ranzhiru].

As long as the necessary movement in the direction of responsibility and realism is not to be observed among the heads of the leading NATO states, the planet's peace-loving forces must tell the U.S. Administration that its continuation of nuclear tests, despite the truly universal protest, is a demonstrative challenge not only to the Soviet Union but to the whole world and all people, including the American people.

Why, you might wonder, has the USSR now concentrated its efforts on ending nuclear tests? In his Soviet television address, M.S. Gorbachev revealed the tremendous significance of this task. First, ending tests is the most realistic way to end the arms race in general. Without such tests it is impossible either to improve nuclear weapons or to create new types. Second, continuing tests does tremendous harm to nature and the home in which mankind lives.

Finally, we do not have to start from scratch, as it were, in this difficult matter: Test have not been conducted in the atmosphere, under water, or on land for many years now. Nor have there been nuclear explosions in space.

The Soviet leader recalled that, having carefully weighed all the "pros" and "cons," on the 40th anniversary of the tragic bombing of Hiroshima, the USSR advanced in initiative of extraordinary importance -- to end all nuclear explosions for both military and peaceful purposes. Our country urged the United States and other nuclear states to follow its example so as to make the moratorium permanent and eternal.

We all know how events developed subsequently. The original deadline for ending the unilateral Soviet moratorium -- 1 January 1986 -- was later extended by 3 months. U.S. nuclear explosions were the response -- Washington was clearly testing our patience. Nonetheless, toward the end of March, the Soviet side took a constructive new step. The Soviet Union declared that it would not conduct nuclear explosions even after 31 March if the United States did likewise. Our country gave the Washington administration one more chance to adopt a responsible decision to end nuclear explosions.

Otherwise we will have to resume nuclear tests. The USSR cannot waive its own security or that of its allies.

Evil Logic of Militarism

It would not be our choice to resume tests -- all our efforts are being undertaken in a different direction. With this aim, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary is prepared to meet with the U.S. President in the near future in a European capital in order to reach an accord on ending nuclear explosions.

And what has happened? This time, the U.S. Administration only needed a few hours to reply to the Soviet proposal. From the Californian ranch where the President was resting came a hasty "no" accompanied by references to the fact that, as long as the arsenal of nuclear weapons exists, it is necessary to conduct tests in order to guarantee their efficacy. (Incidentally, THE WASHINGTON POST immediately remarked sarcastically that, of the 16 tests planned for this year, many are connected with the development of new types of weapons. New ones!)

There is no denying that Washington's secrets are transparent. It is forcing the pace of testing, as West Germany's WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE points out, above all with a view to creating [sozdaniye] space weapons. It has just become known that the Pentagon's nuclear planners are reckoning on conducting another explosion on the same Nevada test site on 8 April. Conclusions will have to drawn from this by our country and its allies, by all other peace-loving states, and by the international public. "When the White House rejected the latest Soviet proposal," an NBC-TV commentator pointed out, "it declared, just as it has done in the past, that the ultimate goal of U.S. policy is the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Such a discrepancy between words and deeds does not work in the U.S. favor now." No beating about the bush, as you see.

Let us take from the endless stream of responses to the recent Soviet proposals concerning a nuclear test ban just one -- an article published in the Canadian newspaper GLOBE AND MAIL. It has a characteristic headline: "Persistent Quest for Peace in Moscow and Quest for War in Washington." What is going on? -- the newspaper wonders. Peace-loving proposals are advanced by a country to which the West ascribes "aggressive" aspirations.

However, the "goodwill" shown recently by R. Reagan, the newspaper states with irony, is far from impressive. Some examples are the refusal to subscribe to the moratorium, the nuclear explosion in Nevada, the violation of the USSR state border in the Black Sea, the preparations for war against Nicaragua, and the military provocation off the Libyan coast.

It is dinned into Americans throughout their life, the GLOBE AND MAIL sums up, that "bad guys" live on the other side of the ocean. However, when you are with Soviet people, you realize why they show valid concern about those who are presented to us as the "good guys."

Not only in the editorial office of the Canadian bourgeois newspaper but literally everywhere people are realizing the worth of the "good guys" from Washington. On Friday, approximately 1,000 prominent public figures and members of the parliament in Sweden published the appeal "Halt Nuclear Tests Now!" It is difficult to take in even with the mind's eye the kilometers-long columns of antiwar "spring marches" which have recently taken place in Western Europe. Whether in the FRG, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, or Switzerland, they have all shown the determination of millions of Europeans to defend their chief right -- the right to life -- and to demand that Washington abandon its nuclear tests and its plans to militarize space.

The peoples' wise logic is proving stronger than the evil logic of the arms race. Mankind is becoming aware that American behavior has recenlty been increasingly running counter to the "spirit of Geneva."

/9274
CSO: 5200/1334

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIETS NOTE FURTHER REACTION TO U.S. NUCLEAR BLAST

Nevada Test Reported

LD101529 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1525 GMT 10 Apr 86

[Text] We have just been brought a cable from Washington. It says that, throwing down an ostentatious challenge to the entire world, the United States has carried out a new nuclear test at the Nevada range. According to a spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy, the force of the nuclear blast was less than 20 kilotons.

Test Shows 'Criminal Contempt'

LD101544 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 10 Apr 86

["Nuclear Explosion in Nevada Is Defiance to Whole World" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Washington April 10 TASS -- Earth shuddered at the test site in Nevada again as the United States set off another nuclear explosion, the second this year. According to press reports, a nuclear device was test-exploded in accordance with the "Strategic Defence Initiative" aimed at the creation of first strike space arms systems.

The explosion in Nevada is another demonstration of the administration's criminal contempt of the calls of the U.S. and world public to join in the Soviet Union's moratorium on all nuclear explosions and thus to promote the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear tests and open the road for curbing the arms race and preventing its spilling into outer space. Moreover, the administration is speeding up the implementation of the program of nuclear testing. According to THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, the United States plans to conduct two more nuclear explosions in April. Obsessed with a futile dream of achieving military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union, Washington proclaims the intention to continue implementing the program of nuclear testing to upgrade the existing systems of weapons of mass destruction and to create new such systems.

The fresh nuclear explosion caused a wave of indignation in the USA. The explosion in Nevada, said Howard Ris, director of the public organization, Union of Concerned Scientists, shows that the administration does not think of arms control. The only thing with which it is really obsessed is stockpiling more armaments. Les Aspin, member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, which has recently adopted a resolution urging the administration to start talks with the Soviet Union without delay on the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty, said with concern that the explosion in Nevada dashed the hopes for an end to nuclear testing that had been kindled by the Soviet moratorium.

Member of the House of Representatives Thomas Downey said that nuclear tests, far from serving the interests of the United States' national security, undermine it still more, since they lead to the spiralling of the arms race. Congressman Edward Markey stressed that the Soviet Union had covered more than half way to achieve agreement with the USA on an end to the nuclear arms race. If the United States continues keeping from reciprocal steps, the President of the United States will go down in history as a leader who rejected a real opportunity to tame the nuclear jinni.

U.S. Crosses 'Nuclear Rubicon'

LD101547 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 10 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes: Bidding defiance at the world community, the Reagan administration conducted a nuclear test in Nevada on April 10.

The U.S. blast can hardly be called "another routine nuclear weapon test". It was staged in conditions where the Soviet Union has observed its moratorium on all nuclear explosions for more than eight months and where Moscow has declared readiness to continue the moratorium until the first U.S. nuclear test after March 31.

The April explosion in Nevada, following up on the White House's expressed refusal to have a summit meeting to discuss a complete end to all testing, can be seen as the U.S. crossing of the "nuclear rubicon", which, unlike the historical precedent, attests not to the present administration's resolution but to its moral and political weakness and its unwillingness to take the first step to bridling the arms race for the past five years.

The latest U.S. blast made it clear that this administration, contradicting the joint Soviet-U.S. statement issued after last November's summit meeting, is still chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of military superiority. This is why the test in Nevada cast doubt also on this U.S. Administration's reliability as a partner at talks.

Washington has taken this dangerous destabilizing step demonstrating its haughty disregard for the vital interests of the U.S. and all other nations, as if it had decided to ride for a fall on the brink of a nuclear precipice.

The geographical name "Nevada" once evoked associations with the "dolce vita" of U.S. nouveaux riches living it up in the casinos and night spots of Las Vegas and Reno. Now the state of Nevada is associated by millions of people across the world with a nuclear war, nuclear testings and incumbent U.S. leaders.

The Nevada blast completed another period in the history of efforts for a comprehensive nuclear test ban. It did not, however, mean an end to these efforts. The stake is too great. It is not just the termination of nuclear testing or even the prevention of a nuclear war. It is the survival of mankind.

U.S. Says Tests To Continue

LD102211 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 10 Apr 86

["White House Representative Rejects Moratorium Idea" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Washington April 11 TASS -- The United States does not intend to limit itself to the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada. Deputy Press Secretary of the White House

Edward Djerejian said that the explosion made on Thursday was part of the programme of tests aimed at ensuring efficiency and reliability of the American nuclear potential.

Edward Djerejian turned down the idea of moratorium on nuclear tests. He asserted that neither moratorium nor a comprehensive ban on tests would promote the cause of security, stability and peace. The White House representative said that tests would continue.

USSR Moral, Political Victory

LD102039 Moscow Televisision Service in Russian 1700 GMT 10 Apr 86

[Studio commentary by USSR TV and Radio Political Observer Valentin Zorin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Hello, Comrades! The latest American nuclear explosion at the Nevada test range cannot be regarded other than as an open challenge by Washington to world public opinion. In the American capital they were unable or did not wish to avail themselves of the opportunity that was afforded by the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, which was introduced and then twice extended, and which was in force for over 8 months. This opportunity consisted, no more and no less, of taking a realistic and substantial step towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race. This time, as a result of the initiative and the practical actions of our country, such an opportunity was, as never before, close and realistic and the greater was the responsibility assumed by those who rejected it. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev warned the other day: More nuclear explosions by the United States will force the Soviet Union to resume its tests. We regret this but we shall be forced to do this as we cannot forgo our own security and the security of our allies.

From the very start Washington has been engaged in dodging the Soviet proposal, has been stating that allegedly the moratorium does not solve the problems. This argument has not worked since even to nonspecialists it is clear that it would seem that such a simple measure as the cessation of tests imposes a limit on the buildup of nuclear arsenals. In the American capital they then seized upon the argument of monitoring [kontrol]: The Russians can allegedly not be trusted -- they are hampering monitoring of tests. Nothing was left of this subterfuge either after the Soviet Union proposed effective monitoring measures, including on-site monitoring.

However, having been deprived of all arguments to hide behind Washington moved toward a breach, the result of which was today's nuclear explosion and a series of new tests whose preparation was announced by the American authorities.

The question arises that the Soviet Union moratorium, whose implementation was not a simple and easy matter for our country, has been to no purpose, has turned out to be in vain and has yielded no result whatsoever. Not at all! What we have here is a substantial moral and political victory of the Soviet Union.

For a long time Washington figures, who have had great success in the sphere of political demogogy, had succeeded in misleading a certain portion of world public opinion, passing themselves off in the role of peace-lovers and portraying the Soviet Union as the culprit of the arms race. There were also those who believed that the United States and the Soviet Union bear an equal responsibility for this race. Now millions of people throughout the world have see the real state of affairs. And the truth, the idea that has taken possession of the masses, becomes a material force.

One more thing: One should not believe that the idea of the cessation of nuclear arms is henceforth a page of world politics that has now ended. Thanks to the Soviet Union's

efforts it exists, has taken root, and will influence the further struggle of people against the nuclear threat. And while today Washington has gone counter to the mood and will of people, including the American people it will find it increasingly difficult to continue doing so. The last word has not yet been said.

U.S. Must Assume Responsibility

LD102135 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 10 Apr 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Hello, Comrades. As we have already reported on the "Vremya" program, the United States today carried out a new nuclear test at the Nevada site. This act cannot be seen as other than a demonstrative challenge to the whole world. In recent days, the movement with the slogan, stop nuclear tests, has reached large proportions in many countries of the world, including the United States. Washington was given a chance to prove that the many assurances by the President of the United States that the United States pursues a peace-loving foreign policy and wants nuclear disarmament are not empty rhetoric but real politics. For more than 8 months, the Soviet Union has not carried out any nuclear tests and has called on the United States to follow this example. If reason were to prevail in the American capital and the United states followed the Soviet Union in stopping nuclear tests, the world would have taken a real step towards delivering mankind from the threat of thermonuclear self-destruction.

Just recently, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed an urgent meeting with the President of the United States to discuss the question of stopping all nuclear explosions. Washington turned its back on that initiative also and did so knowing of the warning by the Soviet Union that further nuclear tests by the United States would force our country to resume tests. By taking this step the Washington administration has assumed a serious responsibility before the whole world and before its own people.

Yet it would be wrong to think that in the struggle to stop nuclear tests, the last word has been said. The initiative of the Soviet Union has been received throughout the world with such understanding and such support and has created such a political atmosphere, that if the United States continues its line, this will cause it an irreparable political loss. The demand for an end to the arms race and as a step towards this, the cessation of nuclear tests, has swept the world and Washington will have to take notice, whether it wants to or not.

Explosion Challenges Logic

LD111217 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 10 Apr 86

[Excerpt] April 10th: The United States has conducted another nuclear test in the state of Nevada. On 6 August last year the USSR imposed a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. On 1 January the moratorium was prolonged until 31 March. The Soviet Union urged the United States to follow suit and declared that its moratorium would remain in force even further if the United States refrained from carrying out nuclear tests. The USSR proceeded from the assumption that imposed by the two biggest nuclear powers, the moratorium would serve as an example to other countries and create favorable conditions for signing an international agreement on banning all nuclear weapon tests. But the United States persists in conducting its tests. Here's what a specialist on disarmament, Lev Semeyko has to say:

[Begin recording] This explosion is a challenge to the [illegible] and to the world opinion. [as heard] Why it's a challenge to the [illegible]? I mean politicians and strategists [illegible] Everybody in the United States knows that President Reagan is for elimination of nuclear weapons. If so, there is no necessity to explode any nuclear devices. It's necessary to stop development of the nuclear weapons, so more it really [illegible].

So the best way for the United States would be to make a good response to the Soviet initiative. But the United States refuses to do that. [end recording]

The United States claims that it needs nuclear tests because it lags behind the USSR in regard to nuclear arms. In the meantime the number of nuclear tests carried out by the United States exceeds the number of Soviet tests by one-third. Last year alone the United States conducted 16 nuclear explosions, seven of them after the imposition of the unilateral Soviet moratorium. It resorts to different pretexts in order to go on with its tests, but why is it impossible to reduce armaments while testing nuclear weapons? Lev Semeyko explains:

[Begin recording] Even should the nuclear weapons be cut quantitatively, its qualitative development can compensate that cutting. It's a very great, I would say, threat to the idea of the elimination of nuclear weapons itself. President Reagan says that he is for transferring to the nonnuclear, outer space, nonnuclear deterrents. If so, why the necessity to develop nuclear devices for X-ray lasers? The appearance of that X-ray laser would mean that the words of the President about the elimination of nuclear weapons, about the nuclear world, will (?cause nothing) I would say. And (?of course) this explosion is a challenge to the world opinion. I believe, I would say that sound men understand that it's necessary to stop. [end recording]

PRAVDA Cited on Lost Opportunity

LD110255 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2309 GMT 10 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow, 11 Apr (TASS) -- "Mankind's hopes of soon putting an end to tests of deadly weapons and clearing the path to a nonnuclear 21st century have been disappointed by the United States," Vladimir Bolshakov writes in PRAVDA, commenting on the latest nuclear explosion carried out in the United States.

"It is clear that the present administration, headed by President R. Reagan, does not intend on principle to forego nuclear explosions. It seeks at all costs to continue them with the aim of creating nuclear weapons for star wars, for the sake of acquiring military superiority over the Soviet Union."

"Concern for gain and profits darkens the eyes of the owners of the military corporations and their underlings, and does not allow them to see the objective truth. The truth is that the United States has again ruined an opportunity of stopping the arms race, which does not add to anyone's security, and only brings mankind closer to the brink of the nuclear abyss."

"The Nevada explosion has given rise everywhere to an explosion of indignation and protest from people of goodwill," the author emphasizes. "The sympathies of the world's peoples are with those who struggle to prevent a nuclear war. The CPSU draws strength from this, from the support of our party's policies by the Soviet people, the socialist countries, and all the world's honorable people, as it consistently strives to attain the goals set in M.S. Gorbachev's statement of 15 January of this year. The USSR's peace offensive will not be stopped by nuclear provocations! The USSR proceeds from the view that the problems of security in the nuclear age are a matter not only for

[illegible] and publications, that plan for its benefit. [illegible] [illegible] involved]

USSR "Does" Draw Moratorium

[illegible]

LD1111[illegible] Moscow TASS in English 1237 GMT 11 Apr 86 — 11 April 1986

["Soviet Government Statement" — TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 11 TASS — In connection with yet another nuclear blast carried out by the United States the Government of the USSR declared that it is now free from the unilateral commitment to refrain from staging any nuclear explosions.

At the same time, the Soviet Government stressed in a statement issued here today, the Soviet Union expresses readiness at any moment to return to the issue of a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions if the U.S. Government declares that it will refrain from conducting such blasts.

"Text" of Government Statement

LD1111[illegible] Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 11 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 11 TASS — Follows the text of the Soviet Government statement:

The nuclear explosion conducted by the United States on April 10, 1986 once again clearly demonstrated that what is really concealed behind the words of the United States Administration about its devotion to the aim of liquidating nuclear arms is intent to further threaten mankind with the nuclear sword, to keep the world in the trap of fear of universal annihilation. Once again Washington has placed the egoistic, imperial ambitions of the United States military-industrial complex above the interests of mankind. The American Government's irresponsible actions are not an open challenge not only to the Soviet Union but also to the peoples of all continents, to the world as a whole.

The alternative to nuclear madness suggested by the Soviet Union in its striving to help stop the buildup of nuclear arsenals is diametrically opposite to the policy of the United States Administration. Last summer the USSR announced the termination of all nuclear explosions from August 6 to December 31, 1985. The Soviet Government persistently called on the United States Administration to join this initiative and thereby make the moratorium mutual. This would have made it possible to drastically slow down the nuclear arms race, stop the qualitative improvement of nuclear arms and the development of new types of such arms, and to embark on the road of practical actions leading to the liquidation of nuclear arms.

After the Geneva meeting of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev with the President of the United States Ronald Reagan the Soviet Government, despite the continuation of nuclear tests in the United States, made yet another constructive step by extending its moratorium till this March 31. Finally, in response to a call by the leaders of six countries - Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden - to the USSR and the USA not to conduct nuclear tests in the period till the next Soviet-American summit, the Soviet side again displayed good will and stated its readiness to refrain from nuclear explosions also after March 31 - till the first nuclear explosion in the United States.

This unilateral restraint in conditions of the continuing modernization by the United States of its nuclear-missile arsenal and the fulfillment of big military programmes.

[illegible]

[illegible]

The Soviet Union has repeatedly given the U.S. Administration a chance to continue to practical tests its statements on the ceasing fire a nuclear-free world, and take the responsible decisions to halt the Soviet accession to nuclear blackmail. In the case that the Soviet leadership agreed, which was also proposed to the Japanese by Mikhail Gorbachev or Soviet scientists on March 31, that all the Soviet Union continued nuclear testing after March 31, the Soviet Union would be forced to resume its nuclear testing.

Since involved in these exchanges, the USA conducted a new nuclear test. The USSR however and declares that from now on it is free from the unilateral commitment made by it in relation from conducting any nuclear explosions. In the conditions that Washington is continuing the nuclear explosions, the Soviet State cannot forget for the security and that of its citizens.

In the case that, the Soviet Union believes, as before, that an end to nuclear weapons testing would be an effective practical step leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons, and to eliminating conditions to secure and close to the question of a general ban on nuclear explosions, provided the Government of the United States declares that it will refrain from conducting such explosions. Thus, the resolution of the question of ending nuclear testing depends, as before, on the USA, on whether the American leadership displays a sense of realism and responsibility.

In the case that, the Soviet Government again reaffirms its proposal on such basis, specific talks on a full prohibition of nuclear weapons testing. The USSR is prepared for any form of talks, any type of agreement on that score, provided things advance toward reaching agreement.

The Soviet government reiterates its proposal on the consequence of the fact of their failure on ceasing and bringing in conjunction the tripartite talks, weapons in 1963, with a view to working out a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. The Soviet Union stands for an unlimited beginning of multilateral talks within the framework of the Geneva conference on Disarmament with the same aim. We are also prepared to reach agreement on spreading the terms of the 1963 Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater to underground nuclear weapon tests for which the USA member of the U.S. General Assembly called.

In order to reach agreement on the cessation of nuclear testing the general decisions of the 1963 General Conference proposed to the U.S. President to have a meeting in the immediate future in one of the European capitals. This proposal remains in force.

As to questions of monitoring the compliance with an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests, there are no insurmountable difficulties here, as is shown by the experience of many years of international discussions of these questions. For the part, the Soviet Union attaches exceptionally great significance to ensuring that possibilities to

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Letter Comments

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Japanese Government Deplores Explosion

LD110841 Moscow TASS in English 0705 GMT 11 Apr 86

[Text] Tokyo, 11 Apr (TASS)--Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe said that his government deplored the U.S. nuclear test conducted in Nevada State on Thursday. Answering inquiries from deputies at the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Lower Chamber of the Parliament, he stressed that "Japan declares for a full ban on all nuclear testing. We resolutely demand an end to nuclear testing."

UN Spokesman on UN View

LD101945 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 10 Apr 86

[Text] New York, 10 Apr (TASS)--In view of the conduct of the nuclear test in Nevada by the United States, an official spokesman of the UN secretary-general has reaffirmed, in an interview with TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshov the stand on this issue which has been repeatedly expressed by Javier Perez de Cuellar. The stand is that a ban on all nuclear tests would substantially limit both qualitate and quantitative development of nuclear arms. Complete and permanent termination of nuclear tests meets the most vital interests of all nations and peoples. The UN secretary-general is of the opinion that the international community attaches the greatest importance to a total test ban agreement. No other multilateral agreement would become the best of evidence of the readiness of all the nuclear powers gradually to slow down the arms race and to press for a substantial limitation of arms and for measures of disarmament.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1334

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR OFFERS TO REINTRODUCE NUCLEAR MORATORIUM

Korniyenko Cited at Press Conference

LD140836 Moscow TASS in English 0827 GMT 14 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS -- The Soviet leadership believes that no task is more important and urgent today than that of arresting the growth of the military danger and saving mankind from the nuclear threat, Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, said at a press conference here today.

Determined to achieve a cardinal turn for the better in world developments, the Soviet Union has identified the struggle to stop the arms race and prevent it in space and to completely eliminate nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction before the end of this century as the centerpiece of its foreign policy in the years to come.

Both common sense and the findings of prominent experts indicate that complete cessation of nuclear weapon tests may be the most effective and at the same time the simplest way of initiating the process of nuclear arms elimination. The nuclear systems already in the inventories would not be upgraded, and it would become virtually impossible to develop new ones.

Today there exists every objective prerequisite for resolving, in a mutually acceptable way and without diminishing anyone's security, the issue of a total ban on nuclear explosions providing for strict verification of compliance with such a ban. What this requires is only political will.

Guided by a desire to set a good example and give the necessary impetus to nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union took a bold step last August in declaring a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. To do so it had to suspend the implementation of a relevant programme at a certain military and economic cost to itself.

Our moratorium initially declared effective until the end of 1985 was extended twice. This was done against the background of an unceasing and, to put it bluntly, provocative nuclear cannonade at the U.S. test ranges.

Each time the Soviet Union candidly warned that the unilateral moratorium could not last indefinitely, that there was a line beyond which it could not continue. That line is determined by the interests of security of our country and that of our allies.

Unfortunately, the U.S. leadership has not passed the test of responsibility, and in Nevada on April 10 it literally blew up a unique chance to stop the nuclear arms race.

As the statement by the Soviet Government of April 11 emphasizes, the nuclear explosion carried out in the United States "has once again clearly demonstrated that behind the U.S. Administration's words about its commitment to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons lies, in effect, the intention to continue threatening mankind with the nuclear sword and keep the world trapped by the fear of total annihilation".

In these circumstances the Soviet Government's announcement to the effect that it is henceforth free from its unilateral obligation to refrain from any nuclear explosions have not, we believe, come as a surprise to anyone.

Does this mean that the proponents of the nuclear arms race have had their way and that the door to a non-nuclear world, just beginning to open, has been slammed shut? We are categorically opposed to this kind of defeatist mentality, to forcing a fatalistic view of the future on mankind.

The Soviet Union is prepared to re-introduce the moratorium on all nuclear explosions at any time, given reciprocal willingness on the part of the United States. Once again, it is for Washington to respond.

The U.S. Government still has before it another proposal of ours concerning a prompt start of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. The USSR is agreeable to any form of such negotiations -- bilateral, trilateral or multilateral -- as long as that leads to an agreement.

In light of the latest developments, we are strongly convinced that not only does the problem of a nuclear weapon test ban remain on the agenda, but that it takes on an even greater urgency, and the Soviet Union intends to seek its resolution perseveringly.

Akhromeyev Cited at Press Conference

LD141107 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 14 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS -- The U.S. leadership, keen to justify its refusal to end nuclear testing, pleads difficulties with verification, but the verification problem can be resolved successfully, Andranik Petrosyants, chairman of the State Committee of the USSR for the Use of Nuclear Energy, told a news conference at the press center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry today.

Answering questions from attending newsmen, he said seismic stations existing in the USSR, the United States, a number of European countries and elsewhere were being continuously upgraded. International seismic data could also be used for verification purposes.

The Soviet side, Petrosyants said, has received with satisfaction a proposal for verification made in a message from the leaders of six nations. It was also prepared for on-site inspections.

"Of course," he said further, "part of the verification-related issues needs certain specifying. This requires sitting down at the negotiating table but with a clearly defined aim, which means that the United States should declare in good faith that in discussing these issues it stands for a complete prohibition of nuclear tests. Without this no discussion can take place."

Replying to a question about the Soviet Union's position as regards the U.S. military threat to Libya, Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, said:

"The main point is not to allow a U.S. aggression against Libya, or against any other nation for that matter. The Soviet Union, for its part, is doing everything in its power towards this end. The same can be said of the other Warsaw Treaty countries. Our contacts with the United States are marked by a desire to prevent an aggression against Libya.

Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR and first deputy defense minister of the USSR, said, when asked if the USSR was assisting Libya, that "there are Soviet military specialists there, who are performing purely technical tasks".

In answer to a question of which kind of connection there was between the latest U.S. nuclear blast in Nevada and the U.S. military buildup in the Mediterranean, he said:

"It is the same policy which is aimed at preventing any lowering of world tension which would enable the U.S. Administration to carry on the arms race and achieve military superiority. The nuclear tests, the heightening of tension around Libya, the intrusions into Soviet territorial waters in the Black Sea and the major military exercises stages by the United States of late have all been part of this policy."

A correspondent of the London-based SUNDAY TIMES asked Marshal Akhromeyev about the measures planned by the USSR in conjunction with Washington's intention to press on with its SDI program.

"Unlike the United States," was the reply, "The Soviet Union does not have any plans for 'star wars'. We are not developing a nationwide anti-missile defense. The Soviet Union's position is one for a ban on space strike weapons at any stage of development. This is why we do not conduct nuclear tests to evolve such weapons."

Answering a question from a TASS correspondent who asked about the rationale for Washington's striving, through all manner of ploys, to evade solving the problem of banning nuclear tests, Marshal Akhromeyev said:

"From the military point of view, it is explained by the fact that the United States has not given up its aim of gaining military superiority over the USSR, a superiority of the NATO bloc over the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The evasion of the resolution of the problem of nuclear testing is connected with the U.S. Administration's intention to continue threatening mankind with a nuclear sword."

Saying that the United States was the champion for the number of nuclear blasts it had set off, he added:

"The USSR is not going to catch up with the United States in this respect. But we hope that common sense will eventually triumph. Can one really go on blasting our native planet forever?"

Korniyenko said that Washington's refusal to stop nuclear testing made it even more imperative to bring about an end to such blasts. Likewise, the current U.S. posturing added further urgency to the problem of establishing nuclear-free zones, including one in northern Europe.

The first deputy foreign minister of the USSR said the Soviet Union was prepared to return to the moratorium at any moment but this moratorium could be only mutual, undertaken jointly with the United States, rather than unilateral.

Setting forth the Soviet position on a summit meeting, he quoted a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev in Tolyatti where the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said that the Soviet side was for another meeting and was not advancing any preconditions for it. But it was essential that this meeting be a step forward, that it bring practical results towards an end to the arms race and that there be a proper atmosphere for such a meeting.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1334

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW DISCUSSES ISSUES FACING RECONVENED U.S. CONGRESS

LD092352 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Apr 86

[Report by station correspondent Andrey Ptashnikov from the United States]

[Excerpts] After the Easter holidays, the U.S. Congress resumed work in Washington. Our correspondent in the United States, Andrey Ptashnikov reports:

The legislators will also be continuing discussion of the draft federal budget for fiscal 1987. In this respect, it should be noted that the increase in military expenditures planned by the government is giving rise to growing opposition from them.

Finally, there is the question of stopping nuclear tests, which is one of the most important on the agenda of the current session of Congress. The relevant bill was tabled for its examination by Pat Schroeder, a member of the House of Representatives. More than 60 congressmen have already officially stated their support for the call to join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

The recent appeal from the USSR Supreme Soviet to the U.S. Congress to do everything it can so that the position of the United States will also help to solve the problem of stopping nuclear testing in accordance with the will of the peoples, with their passionate desire to have stable peace on earth, has also made a great impression on the legislators.

The discussions being resumed in Congress will demonstrate if the American legislators are ready to respond positively to this appeal, and to take specific steps aimed at curbing the arms race.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1334

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET PEACE GROUPS VISIT U.S. EMBASSY IN MOSCOW

Appeal on Testing

OW100755 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0615 GMT 9 Apr 86

[From an unscheduled Novosti newscast; B. Parkhomenko report; officials identified by screen captions]

[Text] A delegation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace [SCDP] has visited the U.S. Embassy in Moscow to convey a letter addressed to Ronald Reagan. The letter contains an appeal from our country's public to the U.S. Administration on ending nuclear tests.

[Begin recording] [Parkhomenko] Our delegation -- cosmonaut Georgiy Grechko, poet Rima Kazakova, writer Genrikh Borovik, USSR people's artist Yevgeniy Matveyev, Prof Alla Mosevich, and journalist Vikentiy Matveyev -- was obviously not expected at the U.S. Embassy. [video shows the named individuals entering a building with the Embassy crest over the door]

For over 30 minutes they were kept in a cramped lobby under the care of a Marine. They were not offered a place to sit and were meticulously questioned about the aim of the visit. At first the confused security officer maintained that, other than junior personnel, there was nobody in the embassy: The ambassador, the press attache, the counselors were all absent. [video shows bearded man with bow tie and identity tag talking to Soviet visitors] Eventually one was found -- the counselor for economic affairs, Robert Fairchild Ober Jr. He also hesitated over inviting the Soviet people into the embassy and very reluctantly agreed to convey the petition and letters to the ambassador. [video shows the counselor receiving a folder, cuts to show the delegation leaving the building, then zooms in to show Grechko]

[Grechko] We came today, especially, because there is information that the Americans are about to explode a bomb. But in fact, it is not a bomb that they are exploding, they will explode an entire process of talks, they will explode a real path to peace that had become delineated, a path to disarmament and liberation of the world from nuclear arms.

And now the reception that we have received here once again reiterates that the U.S. Administration and its mission here do not want to heed the voice of the public, and in fact the voice of the entire world, the voice of reason.

[Borovik] I would like to add to what Georgiy Mikhaylovich [Grechko] has said. We asked them: Should we consider then that we are being received only in the dressing

room, that we cannot be admitted to the embassy? To this, Mr Ober, this gentleman, said they could not admit us to the embassy because they are afraid of terrorism.

[Parkhomenko, turning to Kazakova] How did you react to the fact that you were taken for an international terrorist? [Grechko laughs]

[Kazakova] No, at first Mr Ober recognized me -- apparently he has read my poems -- and generally I am a very benevolent and normal person. And I think that these iron doors are a kind of iron curtain over the heart.

[Ye. Oskolskiy, SCDP secretary] These days thousands of letters and telegrams from all corners of the country are arriving for our committee. Here are just a few of them -- from the clergy, schoolchildren, workers, kolkhoz workers -- and we wanted to convey, and did convey, some of these letters to the embassy. But the message we handed them addressed to President Reagan expresses the aspirations of all the people who write to us, all the Soviet people.

[Borovik] Of course we would like to see this message handed to the ambassador and would like to have the ambassador convey it to President Reagan. Well...

[Parkhomenko, interrupting] Did you receive any guarantees that it will be delivered to the addressee?

[Borovik] We did not receive any guarantees in this matter. We were told that they will look into this question and will adopt a decision, and we ought to telephone to find out the decision.

[Grechko] For the first time in our lives we saw the real iron curtain [laughter] with the manufacturers' label: Made in America.

[Parkhomenko] Well, I think that negative information is also information, and in any case, one can draw quite a definite conclusion from today's event.

[Borovik] In this regard, today we received very important information. [end recording]

Matveyev Views Reception

PM091524 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by V. Matveyev, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, entitled "Confusion..."]

[Text] U.S. Embassy in Moscow, Tchaikovsky Street; 1030 in the morning, 8 April. Representatives of our public, members of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace R. Kazakova, A. Manevich, G. Borovik, G. Grechko, Ye. Matveyev, and the author of this report arrive at the embassy to hand over an appeal from the committee addressed to President R. Reagan calling on him to end U.S. nuclear tests and join the Soviet moratorium on such tests. In addition to the appeal there are letters from Soviet people addressed to the White House with similar insistent appeals expressing both our and other people's feelings and urging the White House to heed the voice of reason!

We are at the entrance to the embassy. After several minutes an embassy security guard appears. We explain the purpose of our visit and mention that we would like to see the

U.S. ambassador or one of the embassy's senior officials. We are ready to wait. We will. The security guard comes back. He reports, but the ambassador is not in the building. But his deputy. They cannot receive us at the embassy. But the security guard is prepared to accept the appeal and the letters and we can stay on.

Is there no senior official in the embassy to whom we could hand these documents?

The reaction to our question is a request to wait again. So we wait again. The security guard comes back. Mr. R. Shaw, responsible for economic affairs, comes to meet us.

The conversation begins with Mr Shaw telling us that significant antiterrorist measures are being applied at his embassy. We do not know how to understand this. We think the "reason" why they do not want to receive us at the embassy? Mr Shaw sees us the Soviet people who have come to see him are introduced. He knows none of them. Consider Kurovik explains why we have come. He wonders why we could not have been received in a more-- how can he put it -- civilized manner.

Mr Shaw says that in his view meetings of this kind are useless because the Soviet press will nonetheless not write anything about the reasons why nuclear tests are being resumed in the United States.

We leave this claim to the conscience of its author. However, a few days ago [illegible], for instance, reproduced statements of U.S. officials to the effect that U.S. nuclear weapon tests must continue so that new types of these weapons can be developed.

We hand the committee's appeal and the Soviet people's letters to the U.S. diplomat and take our leave. We will wait for a reply. If there is one, that is.

Youth Delegation Refused Entry

LD0916134 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 9 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS -- TASS correspondent reports: A Soviet youth delegation was unable to present to the U.S. ambassador in the USSR an appeal of the youth organizations of the USSR to President Reagan. The appeal firmly denounces the stand of the U.S. Administration in the question of nuclear tests. The delegation made of 12 Soviet youth representatives were not received at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

The appeal says that the U.S. Administration pointedly ignores the demands of the peace public to end all nuclear tests and to display a constructive approach to the proposal of the Soviet Union which twice announced extension of the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear tests.

The delegation went to the American Embassy, not far from Moscow's centre, this morning. But they were unable to enter the embassy. After 20 minute-long negotiation [as received] near the entrance to the building, first secretary of the U.S. Embassy in the USSR John Ordway came out and said that the American side was ready to let in only five Soviet representatives. In reply, the head of the delegation, secretary of the Lenin's Young Communist League's Central Committee Vladimir Shapiyko said that the Soviet delegation included 12 representatives of the youth of the country -- workers, peasants, young scientists, students, workers in culture, and they believe that the whole delegation should participate in the talk.

John Ordway repeated that only five persons could enter the building. He added that the room where Soviet representatives were to be received could not hold in a bigger

[redacted]

The nation is increasingly aware of the problem of "waste" in the American economy, the daily correspondence has been noted by President Reagan, and the American public's understandings is based the notion of the Soviet public, the notion of the people of the North Korea, including the American people.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

SOVIET, U.S. UN ASSOCIATION MEET; ARBATOV CITED

PM081328 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin report under general headline: "A Realistic Way to Preserve Peace"]

[Text] Washington -- A number of joint representative meetings and important discussions have been held here, with famous Soviet and U.S. scientists and public figures taking part.

A joint Soviet-U.S. session of the two countries' United Nations Associations was held. A delegation from the Associaton of Soviet Jurists conducted a dialgoue with U.S. colleagues from the organization Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control. Soviet scientists representing the USSR Academy of Sciences met with delegations from the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and the Federation of American Scientists.

Your correspondent spoke with participants in the Soviet-U.S. meetings that took place in Washington. Academician G.A. Arbatov, leader of the Soviet delegation at the session of the United Nations Associations, emphasized that in the course of the discussion particular attention was given to the problems of curbing and terminating the arms race and preventing the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet delegation again drew the U.S. side's attention to the wide range of Soviet peace initiatives.

Particular importance is attached to the question of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union actively advocates their prohibition, perceiving this as the most realistic way to terminte the arms race. The continuation of nuclear tests by the United States cannot be seen as anything else but a demonstrative challenge not only to the Soviet Union but also to the entire world and all peoples, including the American people.

During the joint sessions of the United Nations Associations there was an active discussion on questions concerning the activity of these important international organizations and the consolidation of their prestige mainly as instruments of peace on earth. Having proclaimed 1986 to be International Year of Peace, the United Nations received broad support for this initiative from the Soviet people.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1336

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA'S INTERNATIONAL REVIEW ON TESTING, SDI

PM301750 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 86 First Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korionov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] Main Direction

On the front page of today's issue of PRAVDA you, Comrade Readers, have read the address on Soviet Television by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It is devoted to a question which has assumed tremendous significance in the present situation -- the ending of nuclear tests. It is still possible to halt the nuclear arms race. Urgent actions are needed. This is precisly what the Soviet Union is insistently calling for.

What we have is yet another convincing piece of evidence of how the CPSU Central Committee is fulfilling the assignment given to it by the 27th congress -- to strive, consistently, persistently, and according to plan, to achieve the solution of the problems of international security by orienting the Soviet Union's foreign policy toward unswerving pursuit of a course of peaceful coexistence: toward firmness in upholding our principles and positions; toward tactical flexibility; and toward readiness for mutually acceptable compromises; and an orientation toward dialogue and mutual understanding.

"The contemporary world," M.S. Gorbachev said in his Kremlin speech on 26 March, "and we do not tire of repeating this, is complex and multifaceted. Today the world community comprises very disparate countries. Each of them has its own past, its own traditions, its own national values, and its own specific features. But they all uphold sovereignty and legitimately want to make their own contribution to world politics. A realistic course cannot be pursued if this fundamental distinctive feature of the contemporary world is not taken into account. I want to emphasize that a realization of this and a respectful attitude toward the interests of other states constitute the alpha and omega of the Soviet Union's foreign policy."

The 27th CPSU Congress proposed the creation of an all-embracing system of international security and the practical implementation of this proposal would have a particularly salutary effect on the normalization of the situation in a world so full of contradictions. The year 1986, which was proclaimed International Year of Peace by the United Nations, could become the 1st year of the creation of such a security system and each subsequent year would become a milestone on the path toward the total liberation of mankind from nuclear weapons.

Attempt Against Peace

The events of recent days have confirmed most obviously that certain circles in Washington are taking dangerous steps which are deliberately aimed at creating new "hotspots" on the planet and at tying even tighter knots in interstate relations.

The administration is not only speeding up the implementation of the "star wars" program in the United States itself, but is also intensifying the pressure on its partners in an attempt to place the physical and intellectual potential of the FRG, Britain, Japan, and Italy at the service of its militarist scheme. At the same time, Washington is increasingly unceremoniously raising its hand against the Soviet-U.S. 1972 ABM Treaty and other international agreements.

All these are not separate, isolated acts but components of a deliberate course. Two main directions can be traced particularly clearly in its implementation. First, the attempt to change the international climate and to ensure that the "spirit of Geneva" which engendered hopes throughout the world, including in the United States, might evaporate as soon as possible which would give the forces of militarism the opportunity to open even wider the floodgates of the arms race. Second, the desire by any route, including the use of arms, to impose on countries and peoples which have chosen an independent path of development a policy which suits Washington and to force them to bow to U.S. diktat.

What are the reasons for the intensification of Washington's aggressiveness? One thinks that the main reason lies in the desire of the present ruling elite in Washington to regain at any price the positions lost by imperialism and to implement a policy of social revenge. (F. Knelman) a professor at Montreal University, states in his book "Reagan, God, and the Bomb": "The activity of this administration, which has at its disposal the instruments for destroying the 20th and even the 21st centuries, is directed by people who think in terms of the 19th century."

The ruling circles of the United States clearly have no constructive response to the program of peace and social progress put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress. This is why Washington continues to cling so doggedly to the policy of yesteryear. Of course, the politicians there realize that it is today no longer possible to tilt openly at negotiations between states. They therefore pretend that they are also in favor of negotiations but only those in which the United States might operate from a position of military superiority. The military might of the United States, the head of the U.S. Administration reiterates, is "America's trumpcard."

Such a stance is nurtured not only by anticommunist prejudices which are deeply rooted among the inhabitants of the White House. No small role is played here too by the fact that ultra-right-wing circles in the United States were roused to fury by the "concessions" which, in their opinion, the President made at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva last November. And these circles are exerting ever intensifying pressure on the President, acting in accordance with the motto: "To the right, more to the right!"

Accords have difficulty fitting into the framework of such a policy. Any constructive proposal of ours is turned down in the U.S. capital either straightaway or else by heaping up "conditions" and "reservations." Let us recall: How many years has Washington given assurances that it is in favor of agreements on arms reduction and, they say, the whole point is that the USSR is opposed to verification [kontrol]. We

only had to declare that the USSR is open to verification [kontrol] for those gentlemen to lose all interest in verification [kontrol].

Or this: Washington does not stint on rhetoric in an attempt to give an assurance that the administration is seeking to "make nuclear weapons obsolete and impotent." And so the USSR takes steps which indeed lead to this goal. But, THE WASHINGTON POST attests, this immediately caused indignation in Washington where the USSR's stance was declared to be a far-fetched problem. And in response a hasty nuclear explosion in Nevada followed.

The USSR's moratorium of many months demonstrated a high degree of responsibility for the fate of peace, but by its Nevada explosion, the U.S. Administration showed once again that it lacks such responsibility; the USSR is doing everything in its power to implement the idea of a nuclear-free world, but the United States is blowing up this very idea -- those are the real facts. They cannot be concealed.

The militarist course of the U.S. Administration is encountering a strengthening rebuff in the states of the nonsocialist world too, including in the United States itself. The following fact is symbolic in its way: the day after the nuclear explosion in Nevada, the third largest U.S. city--Chicago--declared itself to be a nuclear weapon-free zone. The number of such cities in the United States is already approaching 110.

Opposition to the adventurous course of the "war party" across the ocean assumed diverse forms. New sections of the U.S. population are beginning to acquire a better awareness of the real essence of the "Star Wars" program. The growth of opposition to this venture among scientists is characteristic. THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER recently cited data attesting to the fact that more than 3,100 professors, including 55 percent of the professors and instructors in the physcis faculties of 20 leading universities of the country, and also more than 2,100 postgraduate students and scientific workers have already pledged not to participate in the implementation of "Star Wars" plans. Among those who have set down their signatures are 14 Nobel Prize winners.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1336

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET REPORTAGE ON WEINBERGER VISIT TO FAR EAST

Nikolayev Examines Japan Visit

OW051001 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 4 Apr 86

[Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] On U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger's visit to Japan, Radio Moscow commentator Nikolayev comments as follows:

At the working-level consultations on Japan-U.S. security issues, held in Honolulu in January this year, it was stressed that Japan's supplementary role in U.S. strategy against the USSR had become more significant. U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary Armitage said that Japan would be like a "lock on the bear's cage," blocking the USSR's exit to the sea.

In this connection, it is noteworthy that Defense Secretary Weinberger's current visit to Japan has started from none other than Hokkaido. The largest corps in the Japanese forces, made up of four divisions, including a tank division, is stationed on Hokkaido, located close to Soviet territory. The United States plans to build a large armory on Hokkaido in preparation for long-term combat action.

It is observed that Defense Secretary Weinberger will ask Japan, during his current visit, to increase its share in maintaining U.S. military bases in Japan. The largest U.S. forces, next to those in West Germany, are stationed in Japan. In other words, some 45,000 American officers and soldiers are stationed at 127 military bases and facilities. Each year, Japanese taxpayers spend over $1 billion in maintaining U.S. military bases, and yet Washington's ambition proves that this amount is insufficient.

In addition to the issue of the armory on Hokkaido, there still remain various issues on the agenda for Japan-U.S. military cooperation yet to be resolved. They include building an airport for night landing training on Miyake Island, and a new command center and other facilities at Atsugi. In an attempt to justify its war preparations in the Far East, the United States acted as if these facilities were necessary to strengthen Japan's security.

However, there are recent incidents indicating that the Pentagon, the U.S. Defense Department, pays no attention at all to Japan's security. In his article, published in the January issue of the NAVY BULLETIN, Admiral Watkins, chief of U.S. Naval Operations, wrote that the United States would launch nuclear strikes at Soviet

facilities from the Sea of Okhotsk in case of military confrontation. Japanese commentators point out, with misgiving, that this indicates the Pacific, the Sea of Okhotsk, and the Sea of Japan will become the main theater of U.S. military operations using nuclear weapons. There is no need to explain how such action would impose danger on the Japanese people. This has also aroused greater and more serious attention by the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Another disquieting piece of news was reported in the Japanese papers the other day. The Pentagon has requested the Japanese side to take measures to protect U.S. facilities in case of nuclear confrontation. It is quite clear from this that the Pentagon regards it is as quite possible for a nuclear war to take place on Japanese territory. There are events which might actually prove this possibility. For example, F-16 fighter-bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, have been deployed at Misawa base, and nuclear-powered submarines, carrying Tomahawk nuclear missiles, have already called at Yokosuka Port nine times this year.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has established a large nuclear structure in Japan, including a strategic communications network and a command center, equipped with special facilities. The United States will need all these facilities merely for launching, from the shortest distance, a nuclear strike on the eastern part of the USSR in case of the so-called emergency. It has been calculated that, in such cases, it will not be the mainland United States which will be the target of retaliatory attacks, but the military facilities thousands of kilometers away from its own borders. This is the best time to take this issue into consideration. Exactly 1 week before Defense Secretary Weinberger left for his visit to Asian countries, a nuclear test was conducted in Nevada in the United States. The act was a hostile challenge to world public opinion as a whole. In his protest message, the Hiroshima mayor pointed out that the explosion was conducted under the USSR's unilateral moratorium. Exercising the utmost self-control, the USSR has extended the moratorium's deadline of 31 March on condition that the United States does not hold any nuclear tests. In its approach to the nuclear issues Washington has clearly indicated its intention of (endangering) the destiny of all mankind, not to mention that of the Japanese and its own people.

After conducting nuclear tests in Nevada, the U.S. Government has indicated its intention of stressing nuclear confrontation with the USSR. It is clear that Defense Secretary Weinberger will seek support for this dangerous policy. Included on the current agenda is an issue concerning Japan's participation in the star wars program, a nuclear program posing great danger to peace. The SDI -- Strategic Defense Iniative -- and nuclear tests are roads leading directly to intensification of global military tension, as well as to global destruction. However, the major purpose of Defense Secretary Weinberger's visit to Japan is to seek support for pursuing such a dangerous policy.

Tokyo Wary of SDI

LD060453 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1219 GMT 5 Apr 86

[Text] Tokyo, 5 Apr (TASS) -- U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, who is here, has demanded Japan's speedy involvement in Reagan's "star wars" program. At talks here today the Pentagon chief tried to butter up the Japanese Government with questionable advantages for Tokyo's participation in SDI, asserting that this was supposedly "very important" for Japan. During the news conference held later he did not conceal the Pentagon's interest in using Japanese scientific and technological potential to implement the plans for the militarization of space. The Pentagon chief tried to justify the aggressive ambitions of the "hawks" from across the ocean with the help of hackneyed conjectures about the "Soviet threat."

However, despite massive pressure, the American visitor did not manage to extract an official agreement from Tokyo to participate in SDI. Prime Minister Y. Nakasone indicated that Japan had a "wary approach" to the "star wars" program and would reach a final decision only on the basis of careful study of the results from a current visit to the United States by a group of Japanese experts. After the talks, Nakasone stated to journalists that he also did not intend to answer on Japan's involvement in SDI at the meeting he will have this month with President R. Reagan.

As the press points out, Tokyo's procrastination over its reply to Washington's demands is caused by internal political considerations. The opposition parties and broad circles of the public are opposed to Japan's involvement in the militarization of space. The leaders of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party fear that officially joining SDI will cause acute dissatisfaction in the country and weaken the conservatives' position at the coming parliamentary elections.

U.S. Continues 'Big Stick Policy'

OW060200 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 4 Apr 86

[Andreyev commentary]

[Text] Commenting on Defense Secretary Weinberger's tour of Asian countries, SANKEI SHIMBUN said that this is part of the U.S. Government's effort to revise its policy toward the Asian-Pacific region. It is common sense to think that a revision in such a case means to redress an outdated policy to make it meet reality.

However, judging from all indications, the U.S. Government is not trying to amend its big stick policy, charged with lethal danger in this nuclear age. Since Washington tries to solve present-day problems by Admiral Perry's means, its policy can never be realistic.

Prior to Secretary Weinberger's departure for Seoul, Mr Sims, Pentagon spokesman, stated that there are vital U.S. interests in the Asian and Pacific region as much as in Europe. His statement actually reveals a blind resolve to also deal with Asian countries from the position of strength.

Last month the United States created very dangerous situations in various parts of the world. It violated Soviet territorial waters, bombarded Libya's coastal area, and keyed up tension in Nicaragua. It then said all this was an action to safeguard its vital interests.

Today, when any regional dispute can possibly develop into a world war, clearly it is very dangerous to use force. To survive is the common vital interest of everyone today and, to safeguard this interest, it is necessary to not only desist from using force but also to refuse to do so. But U.S. [word indistinct] never try to realize this simple fact.

Let us take a look at a recent development. Secretary Weinberger made arrangements in Seoul to continue the joint military exercise "Team Spirit" until 1988. Conducted in the vicinity of Soviet, DPRK, and Chinese borders, the exercise serves as an endless source of tension and provocation and, if something goes wrong, it may possibly touch off an armed conflict. This is evident from the fact that DPRK airspace is incessantly violated during the exercises.

Secretary Weinberger also held talks in Seoul on the deployment of binary chemical weapons. They mean to add these weapons to the U.S. nuclear arms already deployed in

South Korea. Therefore, it is needless to explain what a big threat South Korea poses to Asia because of the United States.

Washington is making the same approaches to Japan, its chief ally in the Far East. Secretary Weinberger's visit to Japan is aimed at drawing Japan into a military confrontation with the Soviet Union. There is no other way to assess it.

It was not by chance that Secretary Weinberger began his visit to Japan with a tour of Hokkaido. Mr Weinberger, who observed a training exercise of the Self-Defense Force's Northern Regional Command, was the first secretary of defense under the Reagan administration to inspect Japan's northern border area.

SANKEI SHIMBUN regards this unprecedented fact as evidence that the United States attaches strategic importance to Hokkaido. To put it precisely, the United States attaches strategic importance to Hokkaido as an advance base located close to the Soviet eastern border.

According to reports, Mr Weinberger plans to strongly pressure Japan into participating in the Strategic Defense Initiative -- SDI. There is a fear that this adventurist plan would bring unforeseen consequences to mankind.

Observers point to the fact that, simultaneously with Secretary Weinberger's visit to Japan, a third batch of Japanese experts left for the United States to study SDI. This does not seem to be a mere coincidence. Washington is actively trying to convert Japan into a direct helper in the nuclear development of outer space.

But this is totally unrelated to the interest of either Japan's security or the security of Asia and the rest of the world.

Since the U.S. nuclear armament plan in Asia is raised as a problem, I think that New Zealand's position should be mentioned. As everyone knows, the Pentagon does not accept New Zealand's position against nuclear arms; and, because of this, it was decided that Secretary Weinberger would not visit that country. This is a good example of the attitude of the U.S. secretary of defense toward an ally's request and wish.

But New Zealand is not isolated in its policy. Thirteen island nations in the region have manifested their support for a nuclear-free South Pacific. These nations think that the U.S. military presence shatters rather than ensures security.

The United States is making no secret of its irritation at such developments. The antinuclear movement in Japan is being subjected to fierce attacks from the official U.S. propaganda machinery. Yet this movement is making further developments, and antiwar mass struggles are also swelling up in other countries in Asia as well.

The mass actions in South Korea show that the antipopular, militarist policy of the dictatorial Chon Tu-hwan regime is met by the resistance of democratic forces. The Philippine Government headed by President Aquino reserved the right to make a free decision on the issue of the presence of U.S. military bases after 1991.

Washington's policy of strength clearly goes against the peaceful aspirations of the people of Asian countries and runs counter to the peace initiative of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Asia, as well as developing countries.

Regarding the peace initiative of these countries as a threat to its imperialist ambition, Washington is exerting itself to strengthen its military presence in the region. Secretary Weinberger is scheduled to have talks on the construction of new military warehouses in Thailand and the maintenance of the Clark and Subic Bay bases in the Philippines.

The purpose of the international maneuvers by the U.S. secretary of defense is to establish U.S. military domination in Asia under any circumstances and to make it possible to force its will on all other countries.

This outrageous policy of strength of the United States can produce only one result -- that is, further increase the danger of war.

Weinberger's 'Anti-Soviet Venture'

LD042325 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1631 GMT 4 Apr 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Nikolay Agayants]

[Text] The Pentagon chief, Casper Weinberger, in the course of his 2-week trip in the Asian-Pacific region, has, after South Korea, arrived in the Land of the Rising Sun. The main aim of the highly placed U.S. guest is to convince Nakasone's government to force the pace of the process of Tokyo joining in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, to more firmly drag Japan into U.S. militaristic plans.

However, Weinberger would not be Weinberger if he did not take part in a provocative anti-Soviet venture. Hardly off the ship -- and off to the party, as they say -- he made for the northernmost Japanese island Hokkaido, where at (Shimo-mazu), near the town of (Iniwa), specially for their visiting guest from across the ocean, the hospitable Japanese organized exercises by the select 7th Infantry Division.

In the last 7 years the U.S. defense secretary has refrained from participating in such dubious demonstrations in direct proximity to the USSR's borders. So Washington and Tokyo have now decided to assign to Weinberger's voyage of inspection on Hokkaido the character of a visit to the front line of confrontation, as the KYODO TSUSHIN agency writes. The Pentagon chief stated to journalists that the United States sees this Japanese island as one of the key areas of military confrontation with the USSR. All these actions by the Pentagon chief, fitting beautifully into the framework of the doctrine of neoglobalism, are clearly at variance with the Geneva accords of the leaders of the United States and the USSR and Washington's high-flown words about their aspirations for peace and cooperation.

PRAVDA Commentator

FND81343 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 86 First Edition p 5

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "Commentator's Column": "Tightening the Reins"]

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger is making a 2-week foreign tour. Its itinerary includes South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, and Australia.

[illegible] Washington's attempts to [illegible] military [illegible] in the Asian-Pacific region and, in particular, of Ronald Reagan's refusal to let allies [illegible] weapons from the [illegible]. These [illegible] concerned about the fate of the American military bases in the Philippines. Moreover, the side of the Philippine [illegible] has [illegible] so far as South Korea, which [illegible] against the [illegible] of Chun Doo-Hwan and [illegible] as increasingly [illegible].

Under these conditions, the Japanese [illegible] [illegible] visit, Washington is seeking to strengthen the [illegible] ties which [illegible] with Tokyo and Seoul, and also with Manila and Canberra. This was clearly demonstrated on the main stage of his tour, in Japan. The Pentagon chief set off for Nakasone [illegible] to support combat exercises by Japanese troops off the USSR's borders, and then for Korea and Guam, where American F-16 fighter-bombers are stationed, threatening the Soviet Maritime Kray. The "star aspect" of Weinberger's trip also speaks for itself.

More than a year has passed since Nakasone declared in the United States that he regards SDI with "understanding." But the Japan ruling circles have not yet decided [illegible] to follow the example of London and Bonn. For participation in the "star wars" program runs counter to three parliamentary resolutions at once: on investigating and opening up space exclusively for peaceful purposes; on renouncing the production, acquisition, and deployment of nuclear weapons; and on banning exports of military equipment and technology. Tokyo's retreat from these positions would give the opposition strong trump cards in the parliamentary election due this summer.

Therefore, a "quiet creeping" into SDI would be preferable for the Nakasone cabinet. I mean giving its blessing to the participation of private corporations in this program without signing an official document between the governments.

To make Japan a direct or indirect participant in the "star wars" program, to equip the South Korean Air Force with an additional number of F-16 aircraft, to expand military aid to the Philippines and Thailand as Southeast Asian "frontline" states (to use Pentagon terminology), to compensate for the crack in the ANZUS bloc by strengthening bilateral American-Australian military ties — these are the chief aims of Weinberger's tour. It is perfectly obvious that Washington's new attempt to accelerate militarist preparations in the Asian and Pacific region is fraught with very dangerous consequences for the peoples of the states situated there.

Termed 'Disappointing'

LD111251 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 11 Apr 85

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger has arrived in Australia on the last stage of his 2-week tour of Asia and the Pacific. On the eve of his arrival in Canberra, the Australian Government again stated that it rejects any participation in the U.S. star wars program. Here is our commentator Vladimir Pashin:

For the fifth time since he took office as defense secretary in 1981, Weinberger has toured Southeast Asia, but probably none of his trips there have been as disappointing as this one for the United States.

In South Korea, the Pentagon chief was able to see with his own eyes the instability of the regime supported by Washington. The United States will maintain its Armed Forces in South Korea for as long as necessary, the minister stated.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

countries and nations by force, to demonstrate force, and, wherever the situation allows, to set force in motion.

[Bovin] The arrogance of force is one of the characteristic features of their policy. Take what happened to us in the Black Sea, when they turned up at Lastochkino Gnezdo. And what happened off the shores of Libya? All that business over our mission at the United Nations. And the hysterics that are going on over Nicaragua. And of course, people sometimes express the thought that, look, the Americans are behaving like boors, but we seem to be doing nothing in response. I have recently received several letters in this vein: How could this have happened, Comrade Bovin? We should have sunk the U.S. ships that came into our territory there. While thinking about this, a thought came into my mind. In 1976, the Americans celebrated the 200th anniversary of their independence, while our state is, I think, over a thousand years old, so as you can see we are 5 times older than they are...

[Beglov] Five times older.

[Bovin] Five times older, yes, and we have far greater historical experience, a far richer cultural tradition, for example, and tradition of political thought. The degree, as it were, of our responsibility in world politics, as actual experience shows, is considerably higher. It is the simplest thing in the world to say an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, but the stakes are very high. Our restraint and self-possession indicate precisely the responsible nature of our policies. Incidentally, the British weekly OBSERVER, which is a quite respectable bourgeois weekly, printed an article entitled "Rambo Prances in Washington," in which the author writes that the West would be shocked if Gorbachev indulged in the outburst of emotion that we accept as the normal course of U.S. foreign policy. He concludes his article with the thought that Reagan's foreign policy is the foreign policy of a fanatic, not a statesman.

[Tsvetov] The statement by the Soviet Government that was published on Friday is yet another piece of evidence that our policy is based, not on emotions, but on healthy reasoning. Despite the blatantly fanatical devotion of the U.S. Administration to continuing nuclear tests, the Soviet Union rexpressed its readiness to return, at any time, to a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions if, of course, the U.S. Government states that it will refrain from carrying out such explosions. At the same time, the Soviet Government confirmed once again its proposal that talks be started without delay on a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests. Surely reason will prevail some time in U.S. policy.

[Beglov] There is nothing left to do for the rest of world but to tell the Americans: Your morality, the morality of your politics has dropped to an all-time low. Let us recall what it was like 23 years ago, when the Moscow treaty on the prohibition of tests in three environments was signed. I happened to be in the United States at that time and saw to what extent people had taken heart who, well, literally, as they say, felt at a dead end over all the misuse of U.S. strength and its arbitrary nature. They could not see a way out. Then finally, there appeared a statesman in the United States, John Kennedy, who, following his very unsuccessful experience in this fist law -- you remember the incursion in the Bay of Pigs and the Caribbean crisis -- said: No, we must start over; we have to put an end to this; we must put down a new marker so that there will be a new beginning in our policy.

[Bovin] All the same, things are getting to the stage where there must be a new summit-level meeting. We would like it to be a new one, not only in terms of its ordinal number but also its content. The question that is most ready for a solution in principle is in fact the question of terminating nuclear tests. There have been many

talks and the positions are to a large extent agreed. The only thing remaining is purely political will and a few technical details. On precisely this question, the United States, as we have just now been saying, says "no" in the most decisive manner. The question then indeed arises: What is it that they want from this new meeting? What are they working toward in general?

[Tsvetov] This kind of analogy arises: The United States invites our observers to the nuclear test site, not to check the termination of nuclear explosions, but to register these explosions, more precisely so as to bless them by their presence. In the same way, summit-level talks should, according to the United States, be just a sort of background against which it is easier to continue their arms race policy.

[Beglov] At any rate, it is clear on our side that we will not compete with them in a demonstration of strength and we will not compete with them in the game of whipping up a new cold war. This, as they say, is their choice and their responsibility. Our choice is different. Our attitude toward the next meeting and our aim at the next meeting boils down to the fact that it should yield both a new quality in relations between the two countries and a new quality with regard to the issues concerning disarmament and those proposals on the agenda. Without a new quality, there can be, of course, no question of the Geneva process, as it is now called, continuing and serving the cause of a change for the better in international affairs.

[Bovin] While there is still just the slightest chance, the task of the politician is to use that chance. If there is no chance, the task is to create the chance...

[Tsvetov, interrupting] ...create the chance...

[Bovin] ...to create that chance, because, I repeat, the stakes are so high, and, our leaders are doing precisely this, without yielding to this virtual provocation the Americans are arranging, without answering force with force, so to speak, by trying somehow to approach all these problems sensibly -- complex, difficult, extremely contradictory as they are -- and to oppose this outburst of force, or whatever, with sense, responsibility, and restraint. If the U.S. tries to put us off concerning this matter, I am sure we will not yield to them.

[Tsvetov] Now we recall that at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva the U.S. side did not wish at that time to renounce the star wars program, or as it is officially called, the Strategic Defense Initiative. Five months have passed since that time however. In these 5 months, opinions have been expressed on the SDI above all by scientists, expressed by many state leaders, expressed -- and this is interesting -- by many former U.S. secretaries of defense and many former U.S. generals. The conclusion of the majority of these reactions is such that the creation of space weapons is, on the one hand, senseless, and, on the other hand, dangerous. Nevertheless, the United States is putting the star wars program into full gear.

[Beglov] Well, for Reagan, this star wars program is in a way something deeply personal. He really believes that he will achieve it, that will be it, and nuclear weapons will not be needed; they will become obsolete and unnecessary.

Even though this argument is absolutely unsubstantiated from an objective point of view and falls apart under objective analysis, Reagan believes in this, and a certain group of people who surround him evidently believe this.

And so they do their best to crank it up more and more, more so since there is a smell in the air not just of billions of dollars -- but of tens and hundreds of billions of dollars -- and the military-industrial complex -- a huge force in the states -- of

course energetically supports all the business. And the result -- well, the result is such that the balance of terror unfortunately is accompanied by a balance of mistrust, too. So this mistrust will grow even further, because when we are faced with the fact of the start of these programs, we will also have to take certain countermeasures in the sphere of offensive arms and in the sphere of strategic arms. In general, the faster all this gathers pace, the more dangerous it will become to live in this world of ours, unfortunately. And this worries us above all.

[Tsvetov] Well, as the Soviet Union has more than once stated, it will not allow any superiority over itself, and the Soviet Union, in response to the U.S. star wars program, will propose and implement its own program, of course, and it will not necessarily be in space. Last week, the Warsaw Pact signatories appealed to the European states and also to the United States and Canada on the question of creating nuclear-free zones in Europe. This appeal says that such zones already exist in certain areas of the world, that this is already a political reality; and this is indeed so. If the current international situation has suggested this sort of thing...

[Bovin, interrupting] There are already three such zones: These are first of all, will include Antarctica, even though it is not one formally; Latin America, and now a certain zone in the Pacific Ocean...

[Beglov, interrupting] ...the southern part...

[Bovin] Yes, the southern part of the Pacific Ocean; there is already so to speak a corresponding agreement...

[Tsvetov, interrupting] That is, if there now exists only one path to achieving nuclear disarmament, that is, step-by-step disarmament, then it is evidently toward the same goal that this, if it can be so expressed, area-by-area solution leads. Now, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, you called one of your articles on this theme "The Zones of the Future." But this future already has its past: I would like you to give us a historical look at the issue.

[Bovin] You see here, you simply have to look at the juridical construction, perhaps, of these nuclear-free zones -- there are two main elements: The state pledges not to deploy, not to produce, and not to maintain nuclear weapons on its territory. This is the first aspect; and the second aspect is that the nuclear powers, for their part, pledge to respect this nuclear-free status and in no way use the threat of nuclear weapons against these states, not to insist on the siting of weapons on their territories, and so on and so forth. So these two elements must coincide. They do not always coincide. For example, take the latest case of the nuclear-free zone in the southern party of the Pacific Ocean, the Soviet Union naturally said: Go ahead! We are ready to sign a corresponding protocol. The Chinese have reacted generally positively to this. But such nuclear powers as the United States, France, and England, have at best kept up an ill-wishing silence.

[Beglov, interrupting] The French have quite openly said that they are against...

[Bovin, interrupting] They have actively [word indistinct], they carry out tests there. So you see here, the whole thing is quite complex. But in Europe there has been talk about this for a long time. There are different variants here -- for example, a nuclear weapons-free zone in the north of Europe, the variant of the Balkans nuclear weapons-free zone, and finally, this corridor which Palme in his time proposed, which...

[Tsvetov, interrupting] ...which is set forth here in this appeal...

[Bovin] Yes, yes, a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe. Nuclear weapons would be removed from the borders dividing East and West in Europe. Here one may argue about the width of this cooridor, but the most important thing here is this: Who is against this? The NATO countries are against it.

[Tsvetsov] And the arguments against this are interesting. I recall the discussion of the issue of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. The idea was put forward back in 1963. And what were the arguments they immediately began at that time? First, that the creation of a nuclear-free zone would increase the danger of a nuclear war; that is, they said, it would unbind the hands of the Soviet Union. But the argument is both completely unacceptable and simply stupid.

[Beglov] Now, by the way, those in NATO rely on another argument, if one may call it that. In the countries of northern Europe, irrespective of whether or not they belong to military alliances, there are, practically speaking, no nuclear weapons.

[Tsvetsov] That, and it makes no sense, is what they say.

[Beglov] Why should we set all that up, because, then, they say, we will be playing a game that is against the interests of the Atlantic alliance and, by implication in the interests of the Soviet Union. Where is the fallacy in such thinking? People presently say, you know, that in Europe it is difficult to start disarmament, including nuclear disarmament because there is no trust. No, there is enough trust. What is a nuclear-free zone? What is the guarantee countries give that they will not site weapons on their territory and the guarantee of the nuclear powers that they will strictly observe their pledges? This is in fact a format for achieving a new level of trust in a specific way.

[Tsvetov] That is, the creation of a zone of trust, as I would call it.

[Beglov] A zone of trust and specific attitudes of trust between the Warsaw Pact and the Atlantic Alliance.

[Tsvetov] I would like to draw attention to another negative argument the NATO leaders are putting forward, namely that the participation, say, of Denmark and Norway in a nuclear-free zone, will limit their freedom of political action.

[Bovin] Well, that limits everyone to the same extent, Sweden, Finland, and our own country, insofar as we will adhere to this. A treaty, any accord limits the rights of those who participate in it to the same degree. You take certain obligations upon yourself. That is the whole point.

[Beglov] A very important watershed is being revealed now between two positions and tendencies in world politics. Some say: Let us not think only about what we will do and say, in the sphere of disarmament, but let us also strive to reach agreement on and perhaps even start with what not to do. If you agree on what not to do, it is easier to talk about what to do. This is the whole problem and it is very important in the context of the struggle for a nuclear-free zone. The more nonnuclear oases there are, the more states are removed from the zone, from the sphere of nuclear strategy, nuclear policy, and nuclear confrontation, and the easier it is to resolve the complex issues.

[Tsvetov] This idea about creating a nuclear-free zone in Europe, and not only in Europe, really does have a great future, because, after all, nuclear-free zones are now being created not only within the framework of states or of certain regions of the

globe, but in individual towns there are even neighborhoods that are declaring themselves nuclear-free zones. This is an indicator of a tendency, an indicator of a desire of the population to have world without nuclear weapons.

Following a decision by the WPC, Asia Week was held 5-12 April. The aim of the week was to activate efforts of the public to strengthen peace and security on the Asian continent and in bordering regions of the Pacific and Indian Oceans. The importance of this week is due, in my opinion, to two things above all: First, Asia is now the most dynamically developing region, where the rates of economic growth in many ways exceed the rates of economic growth in other regions of the world. And then at the same time, this region is distinctive in terms of the enormous number of conflicts, both those that have already broken out, and also those that are still latently smoldering. For this reason, the creation here of an atmosphere of peace and security is extremely important. We are proposing, by the way, a very successful, in my view, approach for the region that is, the comprehensive resolution of security issues. What is being considered here, in my view, is taking into accout the proposals and intentions in the sphere of peace and security, of course, of all those involved in this region. I recall the most significant of these proposals. There is, above all, the all-embracing system of international security put forth by the 27th CPSU Congress. Further, there is a Soviet proposal to discuss and to adopt measures for trust in the Far East, with the participation of all interested countries. Such a step might lead to a lowering of the tension in the region and place one kind of barrier in the path of the arms race. The convocation of a conference of all Asian countries and working out, as proposed by the Mongolian Government, a convention of mutual nonaggression and the nonuse of violence between the states of Asia and of the Pacific Ocean might constitute a substantial contribution to the cause of peace in Asia.

The improvement of the atmosphere in the Far East would be facilitated by an accord on the mutual prevention of the deployment here of new intermediate range nuclear systems. The Soviet Union considers that alongside measures embracing the whole Asian Continent, the gradual attainment of various accords at subregional level would be of important significance, for expample the accords the DPRK is proposing to South Korea. The implementation of the initiatives of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia aimed at attaining mutual understanding and a normalization of relations with the ASEAN countries would be a contribution to lowering tension in Southeast Asia. As to whether these proposals are good or bad, whether they are appropriate or not for one set of states or another, must, of course, be decided at the negotiating table. Above all it is necessary to map out the general line of movement toward peace and security in the region.

[Beglov] I think here, of course, the main thing, given all the complexity of the issue -- and the Asian and Pacific region is indeed such a huge geopolitical concept embracing half the globe with its subregional problems, the like of which have already been talked about here. In general, however, it is necessary to choose between two tendencies. One tendency is the U.S. tendency. This is to make use of the Asian and Pacific Ocean region as a whole or in parts, as a sort of element in the U.S. strategic system, and I would say, following the NATO model. I would call it the eastern front against the USSR and its allies in the Asian and Pacific Ocean regions. That is the U.S. approach. They approach any country or any region with one view: What value does the country represent for them from the point of view of ensuring their so-called vital interests and their global confrontation with the Soviet Union.

The other tendency runs through all the proposals you mentioned: the Soviet Union, the Mongolian People's Republic, the DPRK, the countries of Southeast Asia, India, and many others really want to create, country by country, zone by zone, in the final analysis a general zone of peace. That, it seems to me, is what lies behind our approach to this issue.

[Isvetov] To conclude our conversation at the roundtable, I would like to express the hope that the present year, declared the International Year of Peace by the United Nations, will continue to be used by the peace-loving public to bring about practical steps in the direction of really freeing humanity from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, and the nonaligned countries and also the existence of sensible politicans in the capitalist states themselves serve as the basis for this hope.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1336

RELATED ISSUES

CANADIAN SPECIALIST URGES SATELLITES TO DEFEND NORTH

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 14 Mar 86 p B8

[Text]

QUEBEC (CP) — Canada needs state-of-the-art communication and detection systems to monitor cruise missiles in defending the far North, a strategic studies specialist said Thursday.

Dr. Albert Legault told the Special Senate-Commons Committee on International Relations that Canada needs an infra-red, space-based system for tracking missiles and watching aircraft.

Legault, a Laval University professor and former consultant to the defence department, also called for satellites for cross-country military communications.

"This should be our first priority because it ties in with all our commitments, be it for Europe, maritime detection or cross-Canada communications," he said in an interview.

"Canada can be very useful in terms of detection and warning."

But Legault said Canada would still depend heavily on the U.S. for the defence of the Arctic if a crisis developed into war.

"We do have some capability for air defence. It's still substantial — the CF-15 is still a very good aircraft."

Legault told the committee that Canada should have at least one super icebreaker, but detection and communication needs are more pressing than control of the Arctic depths. He noted a nuclear submarine would cost about $20 billion.

Legault also dismissed the suggestion that Canada should adopt a neutral position and withdraw from its alliances.

"Canada needs NATO more than NATO needs Canada. We can't just abandon 40 years of Canadian foreign policy.

"We helped to establish NATO to escape the pull the U.S. was exerting on Canada."

But Canada has too many commitments in NATO and it's time for a major public debate on its role in the alliance, Legault said.

Canada might withdraw troops from Europe and increase its air force role, he suggested. Another option might be to reduce Canada's brigade strength in central Europe and add to the brigade strength in Norway, or vice-versa.

"There are a number of options to study. They haven't been clearly negotiated with our allies and they aren't known to the public."

The committee, which includes 11 MPs and five senators, is holding hearings across the country. It will meet next in Vancouver March 17.

/12851
CSO: 5220/33

RELATED ISSUES

CANADIAN REACTION TO NORAD AGREEMENT SIGNING REPORTED

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 20 Mar 86 p A3

[Text] Prime Minister Brian Mulroney scored few points with opposition MPs Wednesday for his renewal of a joint Canada-U.S. air defence agreement and a promise that everything will be on the bargaining table in upcoming free trade talks with the U.S.

On the second day of the two-day Washington summit, the leaders officially renewed the North American Aerospace Defence Command agreement for another five years, without reinserting a clause that rules out Norad participation in anti-ballistic missile defences.

In separate statements produced after the signing ceremony, both leaders stressed that the accord "is fully consistent with the provisions of the superpowers' 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty," which provides for limiting development of nuclear defence systems.

But opposition MPs said that Canadians should have the additional protection of the ABM clause that appeared in the former treaty.

An all-party parliamentary committee had unanimously recommended the clause be included in the renewed agreement.

Liberal Leader John Turner said Canadians are worried the change means they could be drawn into the U.S. Star Wars program.

"A declaration from the White House is not as strong as having the clause inserted in the treaty."

In the House of Commons, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark defended the move, saying that Mulroney was able to secure from Reagan a full recognition of Canada's concerns.

But in spite of Clark's interpretation of what lay between the lines in the Washington statement, New Democrat Leader Ed Broadbent contended that Mulroney wasn't able to get "a recommitment to the ABM Treaty" from Reagan.

Broadbent said the weak language of the statement "really betrayed" Canadians who are concerned about the possibility of being dragged "willy-nilly, via the Norad agreement... into Star Wars."

Broadbent was also harshly critical of the fact that Mulroney agreed to American demands that everything be on the table during discussions on free trade.

Mulroney was given assurances by Reagan that the talks will begin this spring.

Congress have until the end of April to block Reagan's request to open free trade talks with Canada, but fears it might do so were largely dispelled Wednesday by House Speaker Tip O'Neill.

In unplanned remarks during Mulroney's appearance at a congressional committee, O'Neill endorsed the free trade talks.

"We expect those talks to receive congressional approval in the next month."

Both Canadian and American officials told reporters following a meeting between Mulroney and

Reagan Tuesday that everything should be on the negotiating table, including various Canadian subsidy programs.

However, the Canadians attempted to draw a distinction between what issues are on the table if negotiations begin and what Canada is willing to accept in the final pact.

But Broadbent said the agreement means marketing boards and socialized medicine will be negotiated despite previous government commitments that they would not be included.

Clark, however, told the Commons Wednesday Canadian culture, bilingualism and other social programs such as UIC and medicare are non-negotiable.

"I speak for the government of Canada in the matter. I have made it clear that medicare and the other matters referred to by the leader of the New Democratic Party are not at issue in the trade negotiations."

/12851
CSO: 5220/33

RELATED ISSUES

CANADIAN LIBERALS SEEK END TO U.S. CRUISE TESTING

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 24 Mar 86 p A4

[Article by Christopher Waddell]

[Text] HAMILTON

Ontario members of the federal Liberal Party endorsed a resolution yesterday demanding an end to cruise missile testing in Canada and declaring the country a nuclear-weapons-free zone.

The proposal, one of 35 resolutions passed at the Ontario wing's annual meeting, contradicts past Liberal Party positions on the cruise issue. It was approved 189 to 141 in a docile policy session attended by less than a third of the 1,800 registered delegates and observers.

In 1983, the Liberal government of Pierre Trudeau approved cruise testing by the U.S. military in the Arctic and Alberta.

"I think it is a step forward for the party," said MP Sheila Copps, honorary chairman of the meeting, when asked about the party's apparent change of heart.

"There is a feeling within the party that we should be moving away from automatically adhering to the NATO and NORAD lines on this issue."

Other resolutions approved yesterday included calls for a fundamental reform of the personal tax system and the introduction of a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians, continued opposition to capital punishment, support for specific cuts in emissions causing acid rain, and a demand for the reinstatement of the Katimavik program for youth.

The convention also unanimously endorsed a special telegram of support to Senator Jacques Hébert, who is entering the 15th day of a hunger strike in Ottawa to protest against the Conservative Government's decision to end Katimavik.

Delegates also proclaimed without debate their opposition to the Mulroney Government's approach to free-trade negotiations. On Saturday, the question had generated heated discussion in a policy subcommittee.

While yesterday's sessions concentrated on policy, the party's leadership was on the minds of many during the weekend. The issue did not generate public debate, even though the party will decide at a national convention in November whether to hold a leadership review. Even so, there was some isolated sniping at party leader John Turner.

Delegates found an anonymous attack on Mr. Turner slipped under their hotel room doors one morning, while Niagara Falls delegate Joseph Pillitteri held court about the leader's faults in the halls of the convention centre.

Patrick Kutney, a delegate from the Toronto riding of Davenport, circulated a speech harshly critical of Mr. Turner's leadership that he planned to give in running for the post of party executive vice-president. But others, including Davenport MP Charles Caccia, persuaded Mr. Kutney to withdraw from the race shortly before nominations opened.

Newly elected Ontario party president Seymour Iseman of Toronto, who had been the party's executive vice-president, dismissed talk of dissatisfaction with Mr. Turner's leadership.

"I didn't see it as in any way appreciable," he said after his victory.

On Saturday, Mr. Turner stressed some familiar themes to the delegates, attacking Finance Minister Michael Wilson's budget while concentrating on three issues — the growing gap between rich and poor in Canada, the need to pay greater attention to education, and the importance of reasserting Canada's national identity and sovereignty.

To widespread applause, the party lead-

er served to on Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's Washington visit last week, calling it an exercise in cosmetic diplomacy.

Next year, Mr. Turner suggested, the Prime Minister should celebrate St. Patrick's day alone in Baie Comeau. "These trips (to Washington) are costing us too much. They're humiliating us and they're embarrassing us."

Responding to their leader's platform performance, the delegates gave Mr. Turner a prolonged standing ovation at the end of his speech.

In contrast to the isolated open dissent, Mr. Turner was greeted warmly at an hour-long accountability session with party members on Saturday morning.

"The mood of the party has moved from internal reflection to the issues of the day," he said after the session in comparing last year's Ontario annual meeting with this weekend's event.

Several delegates focused on sovereignty and U.S.-Canada relations, asking about free trade, acid rain and last week's renewal of the North American Air Defence Agreement with the United States — all springing from the Prime Minister's Washington trip.

"We are not impressed with Mr. Mulroney's negotiating ability," Mr. Turner told the delegates to widespread applause. "We've seen now two successive summits and the only winner on either occasion has been St. Patrick. It sure hasn't been Canada."

/12851
CSO: 5220/33

CANADA: IMPACT OF DEFENSE SPENDING SLOWDOWN EXAMINED

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 10 Mar 86 pp E1, E4

[Article by Sharon Robson]

[Text] *O, Canada, we stand on guard for free.*

Federal government defence-spending critics may soon suggest the above reworking of the last line of the national anthem in light of spending slowdowns for new defence systems and equipment during the next five years.

The federal department of national defence has been told it can expect only a two-per-cent real annual growth in its fiscal budgets (April 1 to March 31) between 1987-88 and 1990-91.

This level of funding will not produce enough cash to finance a multitude of equipment projects now on the drawing boards. To solve the problem, the department will either have to decrease the quantities bought, or spread the purchases out over a longer period.

For Ottawa-region firms, this means a new era of uncertainty with the main concern being the length of time that lower-priority programs will be stretched out.

The Senate special committee on national defence has criticized the approach because, in its view, it offers "false economies" of patchwork policies and piecemeal purchasing. But federal Finance Minister Michael Wilson's budget appears to leave the defence department with no other choice.

According to the spending estimates tabled Feb. 27, the defence budget is $9.9 billion in 1986-87. When big items such as Armed Forces pay and the day-to-day costs of using military equipment are deducted, only about one quarter of the budget remains to pay for new weapons purchases.

Canada actually devotes a bigger portion of its defence spending to buying new equipment than many of its allies. But it is still paying the price for a period of drastic underfunding in the early 1970s.

The high cost and complexity of most major weapons systems means that equipment purchases are spread out over many years. This limits the financial flexibility of DND because at any given time the department is still paying for programs that were started up to 10 years ago.

For the next few years the most vulnerable programs are not the ones already underway but, rather, those on the verge of approval, such as the Low-Level Air Defence System (LLADS), the Tribal-class Destroyer Update and Modernization Program (TRUMP), and the second phase of the ship replacement program (SRP2).

The following is a brief roundup of the status of the defence department's major weapons programs in the wake of the recent budget.

- Currently, just two equipment programs are taking up 50 per cent of the 1986-87 capital budget — the CF-18 fighter aircraft program and the Canadian Patrol Frigate (CPF) project.

The $6.9-billion CF-18 program is the more advanced of the two. It began in 1977, although the actual contract for 138 new CF-18 fighter aircraft was awarded to McDonnell Douglas Corporation of St. Louis, Missouri, in 1980. Because defence contracts are spread over so many years, it is necessary to talk about the program costs in terms of "budget-year" dollars, which take into account the value of the dollar in the year that it is spent. This means the CF-18 program would cost $2.3 billion in 1977 dollars but $6.9 billion in budget-year dollars.)

Canada has taken delivery of 77 CF-18s and will have received all 138 by September 1988. This versatile fighter is meant to replace three types of fighter aircraft now in service with the Canadian Forces — the CF-104, CF-101, and CF-5.

Although the contract for the CF-18 went to an American company, Canadian companies have benefitted from the deal, both from negotiated offsets and from other, smaller contracts associated with the program.

Currently up for grabs is a contract to supply engineering support for this aircraft. The contract is supposed to be awarded this summer and could be worth about $1 billion over the 20-year lifespan of the planes.

Three Canadian consortia — headed by Canadair Ltd. of Montreal, Bristol Aerospace Ltd., of Winnipeg, and IMP Aerospace Ltd. of Dartmouth respectively — are bidding on the contract.

• Under a separate $341.4-million program, Defence is buying 400 of the radar-guided SPARROW AIM-7M missiles and 472 of the heat-seeking SIDEWINDER AIM-9M missiles for CF-18s.

• A contract for six new anti-submarine frigates was awarded to Saint John Shipbuilding in July 1983. Saint John Shipbuilding, as prime contractor, is managing the project and also building three of the ships. The remaining three are being built under a sub-contract by Marine Industries in Sorel, Que., and Versatile Davie in Lauzon, Que.

Design problems have delayed this $5.3-billion program, so the first ship will not be delivered to the navy until September 1989 — seven months late.

However Saint John expects to make up time with a new unit-construction method and complete the delivery of the sixth ship as originally scheduled in April 1992.

Paramax Electronics Inc., in Montreal, a subsidiary of U.S.-based Sperry Corp., has the main sub-contract for the frigate program. Paramax is designing and engineering the combat and electronic systems for the six ships.

• Defence is buying six Dash-8 aircraft from de Havilland Aircraft Company under a $70-million program to replace four Buffalo transport aircraft on navigation trainers at the flight school in Winnipeg, and to replace two DC10-30s serving as passenger transport aircraft in Europe. The DHC contract for $60 million was signed last fall and the deliveries will be completed in 1988.

• Under a $111.3-million program Defence is buying eight Challenger 600s and four Challenger 601s from Canadair Limited, mainly for the electronic support and training roles. All 12 aircraft will be delivered by May 1987.

• Having recently completed the purchase from Bombardier Inc. of Valmont, Que., of 2,707 military pattern 2½-ton trucks, the defence department is now buying 2,500 Bize ¼-ton trucks from the same company. The $115.1-million program will be completed in September 1988.

• After the government signed an agreement last March with the U.S. to modernize the North American Aerospace Defence Command radars, the defence department awarded a contract worth approximately $200 million for communications equipment to a consortium comprised of CANAC Consultants Ltd. of Toronto and Microtel Ltd. of Burnaby, B.C.

• Last year, Litton Systems Canada Ltd. completed a project definition study of the destroyer modernization program. Approval for the implementation of that $970-million program had been expected last summer, but budget problems have delayed it.

Defence is preparing to present a revised program to Cabinet within the next few weeks.

• At the same time, the defence department will send to Cabinet its recommendations on the bids for the Low-Level Air Defence System contract. Three consortia are bidding for the $600 million contract: AB Bofors of Sweden and Canadian Marconi Co.; Contraves AG of Switzerland and Raytheon Canada; and Oerlikon-Buhrle Ltd. of Switzerland and Litton Systems Canada.

The winner is expected to be announced by April 1 and deliveries of the new system should begin in 1988.

• A follow-on to the CPF program is still in the study stages. A decision on whether to proceed with the purchase of more frigates will not be taken until 1987.

RELATED ISSUES

ID-WORLD LEADERS PLAN ARMS CONTROL APPEAL

[NHK]0137 Tokyo NHK in English 1130 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Fukuoka, Kumagaya Pref., 9 April NHK--A group of former heads of state and government plan to make recommendations on arms control prior to the proposed second summit between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev, former Algerian leader Chadeqdar Ghanandjo said Wednesday. He said reporters at the end of the second-day of talks among 20 former heads of state and government and six former government ministers that they also decided to appeal to the Central American countries to desist from further intensification of the military conflicts in the region.

The group, called the Interaction Council, focused on East-West relations, apartheid, terrorism and general issues of peace and security, a spokesman said. The council, a private organization made up of 30 former heads of state and government, has been sponsoring annual sessions since 1983 for the ex-leaders to debate issues of peace and security. After an opening ceremony in Tokyo last Sunday, the council moved its proceedings to this resort town for closed-door deliberations, which are as one council member put it, "unrestrained" by partisan stands.

The concept of what security means needs to be amplified, particularly in the context of the third world, where most of the military conflicts since the end of World War II have taken place, said former Swedish Prime Minister Olle Ullsten. Security "is not only a matter of foreign policy or a matter of defense policy," he said in a television interview during a luncheon cruise in the nearby Ashinoko Lake. Security "often involves social and economic factors, particularly in the developing countries," he said.

On the worldwide issue of peace and security, Ghanandjo said the issue cannot be divorced from the relationship between the two superpowers--the United States and the Soviet Union--particularly in matters of arms control. He said the council plans to outline its views on arms control in a final communique expected to be issued at the end of Thursday's meeting. The council will try to find "the most appropriate means to convey our appeal" in the final statement, he said.

On apartheid in South Africa, Sardar Swaran Singh, a former Indian foreign minister and co-chairman of the interaction council policy board, warned that "time is running out. Some quick action is needed," he said, noting that the

council is probing possibilities of a meaningful negotiation between the South African Government and antiapartheid movements. However, apartheid "is primarily a matter for the South Africans to decide," he said.

Elaborating on the council's concern about military tension in Central America, Obasanjo said the council is appealing to all concerned to refrain from further complication and intensification of the conflict in the region. Arguing for the conclusion of a nonaggression pact in Central America, Manuel Ulloa, a Peruvian senator, said peace and stability in the region should create favorable conditions for a "generous stand" from the industrial countries on the financial and economic plights in the region. As a result of military conflicts, countries in Central America are spending "far above our capability" in defense, he said in an interview.

/12913
CSO: 5260/076

END

END OF FICHE

DATE FILMED

May 8 86